

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 26, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Oh, the depths of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God. How unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past finding out.

Heavenly Father, help us to hope, pray, and aspire with faith and confidence, for in Thee we live and move and have our being; thus may the tangled webs of life be unraveled and misunderstandings made clear. Thou who art the source of all good, be with us that we enter not into temptation and do wrong to no man. Very soon, blessed Lord, give answer to that prayer which falls from countless lips each day: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven," and unto Thee be eternal praises. Through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I understand that there is no business ready for tomorrow.

Mr. RAYBURN. No, and I might say this to the gentleman. It had been the hope that the independent offices appropriation bill would be ready during the coming week, but during the hearings so many documents were asked for that it made the hearings so long that it is impossible to have the hearings printed and to report the bill next week. The earliest we can hope for that report is on the 6th of February, which would be Monday week.

There is very strong probability that the Committee on Ways and Means will be able to report and be ready to consider the matter known as the exemption of retroactive taxes on State salaries sometime next week. That committee does not hope to bring in the bill in response to the whole recommendation of the President at that time, because the matter of taxation of State securities, and so forth, would take longer consideration.

The chairman of the Committee on Rules has been asked to give hearings early next week on the resolution of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] with reference to extending the life of the Reorganization Committee. Unless those two things are in the House next week or unless some committee reports something that I do not expect at the present time or have not been notified about by the chairman, that will be the extent of the program next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then nothing of importance is likely to come before the House on Monday or Tuesday of next week? Several Members are anxious to know about that.

Mr. RAYBURN. No; except that the relief bill in some form in all probability will be before the House on Monday next, and there might be some votes, very important ones, in connection with that measure at that time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And, of course, that would depend somewhat on what the Senate does.

Mr. RAYBURN. That depends on the decision the Senate reaches today or tomorrow on some matters.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Has the gentleman any knowledge of when the Committee on Rules might meet to consider the continuation of the Dies committee?

Mr. RAYBURN. That will certainly be not long delayed.

Mr. FISH. Has the gentleman any idea of whether the Rules Committee will meet next week to consider the matter?

Mr. RAYBURN. I think the gentlemen who have been in charge of that investigation are hoping that it might be done during the week, but no decision has been reached.

Mr. FISH. It will probably not be reported back to the House next week?

Mr. RAYBURN. Of course, Mr. Dies and his committee want that issue decided at the earliest date possible. I do not think that he has asked for a hearing yet before the Committee on Rules, but there is strong probability that it may be asked for next week.

Mr. FISH. The Rules Committee has not yet met?

Mr. RAYBURN. The Rules Committee has not met, but applications are coming to the chairman at this time for hearings.

Mr. FISH. There is no disposition on the part of the majority leader to delay consideration of that matter?

Mr. RAYBURN. Not at all. I assure the gentleman that will be taken up for consideration at as early a date as seems feasible.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Last week I asked the majority leader what action would be taken this year by the Congress, or at least the House, or the leaders of the House, relative to trying to keep the Government spending down to a point where the people of this country might expect, reasonably, at some time in the near future to balance the Budget.

Mr. RAYBURN. It has always been our purpose over here to hold the expenditures of the Government to the lowest point consistent with taking care of the needs of the people, and that is our purpose this year. We are hoping, of course, that some of these days we may balance the Budget; and when that time comes, when we start in that direction, we trust that the gentlemen on the other side, including the great economist from the State of Pennsylvania, will not just make speeches about balancing the Budget but will vote that way.

His record has not been very consistent in that fashion in the past.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman cannot put one thing in the RECORD to show that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has not been consistent. I ask the majority leader, if we are going to adjourn until Monday, if he should not keep this House in session and try to get some economy into government. Whenever you point the finger at the gentleman from Pennsylvania you are on the wrong track. I will say the majority leader is the man who should come out here now and try to speak for economy. He is the one who should show the people of this country where you are going to get the money. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. RAYBURN. I may say that I think I can look through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and find many instances where, during the consideration of appropriation bills, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has spoken for economy and then when an amendment to increase the amount was proposed the gentleman voted for it. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. RICH. There is only one place where you can show that, and that was on the rural electrification proposition. I ask the gentleman from Texas to put them in the RECORD now and show the people of this country where the gentleman from Pennsylvania has not been for economy and where he will stand back of you Democrats if you will get out here and work for economy.

Mr. RAYBURN. Just so the gentleman stands back it will be perfectly satisfactory. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and the legislation program

of the day I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the special orders for today and any business on the Speaker's table I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I make a similar request, that following the other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is that agreeable to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES], who has a special order at this time?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have only a few minutes myself and I would like to have this matter read, and I would prefer that the gentleman from Indiana follow on account of this, if he does not mind.

Mr. HALLECK. I will yield, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SUGAR LEGISLATION

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on two or three occasions during this session there has been some criticism of the administration of the sugar legislation. The criticism is legitimate and this is the proper forum for that criticism. However, I think it is important in any discussion that both sides of any question be presented. It is one thing to criticize. It is another matter to administer a far-reaching piece of legislation. That is always fraught with difficulties, especially when there is as much involved and as many different areas are involved as in the handling of sugar legislation. For that reason I am going to ask that there be read in my time a statement from the Department, giving their viewpoint of the sugar legislation, its problems, its difficulties, its outlook, and a contrast with the conditions that prevailed before the legislation was enacted. It is only three or four pages long, and I ask that this letter be read in my time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the Clerk will read the letter the gentleman refers to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the letter as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 24, 1939.

HON. MARVIN JONES,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. JONES: In response to your request of January 19 for certain data with respect to some of the questions raised in a recent congressional discussion about the program under the Sugar Act of 1937, we are pleased to submit the following information:

Briefly summarized, criticism of the sugar program in recent congressional discussion relates almost entirely to an assumed inadequacy of income for sugar-beet producers under the sugar program and the fear that the small reduction in the duty on Cuban sugar from 0.90 to 0.75 cent per pound, raw value, now under consideration in connection with the pending trade-agreement revision, may further curtail such income. It may therefore be useful to summarize the elements of protection and benefits for the sugar industry provided by the Congress in the Sugar Act of 1937. The prior sugar legislation of 1934 was of a similar nature. The four outstanding elements in the sugar program are as follows:

1. Limitation through quotas on the admission of foreign and insular sugars, which limitations have been fully effective and restrictive each year since 1934, and limitations on marketings of the mainland sugarcane and sugar-beet industries, which have been nominal since 1935 because production was generally below the quotas for such areas established in the legislation.

2. Limitation through quotas on the imports of liquid sugars from Cuba and Santo Domingo and outright prohibition or embargo on the importations of such sugars from other foreign countries in excess of 10 short tons.

The effect of these quota limitations has been to maintain a differential in the price of sugar in the United States above the

price of unprotected sugars (seaboard basis) and in favor of domestic production of 2.17 cents per pound in 1937 and 1.80 cents in 1938, equal to an ad valorem protection of 168 and 159 per cent, respectively, not including the Federal payments to growers.

3. Federal conditional payments to producers of 60 cents per 100 pounds of recoverable sugar, pursuant to title III of the act, which, on the basis of average yields of beets in the United States, equal about \$24 per acre. For the 1937 and 1938 crops of sugar beets payments were made under the act on the total production of the growers, without any limitation of acreage or production. For the 1937 crop, \$16,966,000 has been paid out to date, covering 46,700 applications for payment, comprising practically all producers of sugar beets, an average of \$362 per farm, and for the 1938 record crop of approximately 1,700,000 tons of refined sugar it is estimated that the Government payments will aggregate \$20,300,000. These payments are, of course, supplementary to the payments made to growers by the processors.

4. Special payments to producers in the event of abandonment of acreage or deficiency in production under certain conditions as the result of natural causes beyond control of producers, such as freeze, drought, insect pests, etc. Producers are not required to pay premiums in money or in kind for this form of crop insurance.

As the result of the above measures and similar legislation in 1934 the acreage and average returns of mainland sugar-beet producers under the administration by this Department have been increased as follows:

	Acreage	Average income per ton	Farm value
Average, 1909-14.....	485,000	\$5.50	\$26,697,000
Average, 5 years preceding sugar program (1929-33).....	785,000	6.09	54,249,000
Average, 5 years following sugar program (1934-38) ¹	798,000	6.79	60,428,000
1938 (estimated).....	931,000	16.30	70,814,000

¹ 1938 estimated.

The income per ton of cane for mainland cane growers increased from an average of \$3.39 in the 1929-33 period to an average of \$3.98 per ton in the 1934-38 period, while the farm value of the sugarcane crop increased from \$10,134,000 to \$20,624,000.

The net income of the five major sugar-beet processing companies, representing about 75 percent of the total sugar-beet production of the United States, expressed as a percentage of their net worth averaged over 9 percent for the 5-year period of the sugar program, 1934-38, as compared with a loss of 4.2 percent in 1932 and 1.9 percent in 1933. (These figures are for the fiscal years ending in the spring of each year.) For the year 1937, primarily as a result of the invalidation of the sugar processing tax, the net income reached 12.47 percent.

Under the somewhat adverse conditions of decreased general purchasing power of consumers in 1938 and greatly increased sugar-beet and sugarcane production during the years between invalidation of crop adjustment in January 1936 and resumption thereof under the new Sugar Act, a reduction in net income for the fiscal year ended in the spring of 1939 may be anticipated.

Statements have been made in recent congressional discussion which would indicate that the share of the domestic industry in supplying the United States market has been decreased under the sugar program. The fact is that the domestic share has increased markedly while the proportion of the United States consumption supplied by Cuba and other foreign countries has practically been cut in half under the sugar legislation, as compared with the late twenties. In 1938 Cuba contributed about 28.8 percent of the total United States requirements as compared with 43 to 53 percent in the period 1925-30.

The 1937 sugar-beet crop, the first to be marketed under the new law, gave the growers an income per ton equal on the average to parity prices. The increase in the income to growers from the 1937 crop will average close to \$10 an acre over that of the preceding year. Independent growers of sugarcane will benefit similarly. The margin of the processors has been reduced somewhat but they have benefited from increased volume of tonnage, which has resulted in part from the assurance of a more equitable division of total returns. It is significant that the first sugar-beet plantings after the enactment of the Sugar Act have been large enough for the first time since 1934 to justify the expectation that the industry will be able to fill the sugar-marketing quota established for the sugar-beet area.

The income of sugar-beet and sugarcane growers was increased and the total income of the sugar industry was maintained, despite a decline in the general purchasing power of consumers. Moreover, this was accomplished without the evils of a rigid price structure. It is particularly significant that consumer requirements for sugar were adequately met at varying prices as industrial recession and recovery caused variations in consumer incomes.

It will be noted from the foregoing that the references in the congressional discussion to the "record low prices for sugar" have been misleading, since the Federal payments of 60 cents per hundred pounds of sugar paid directly to the producers under the sugar program were not taken into consideration.

The second marketing year under the Sugar Act (which is the current crop) began in September 1938 and will terminate in September 1939. It is too early to forecast the outcome for sugar-beet producers, since only a portion of the sugar from that crop

has been marketed, and under their participating contracts with processors growers ordinarily receive about half of the net sales value of the sugar processed from the cane or beets sold.

It is to be noted that, because the sugar-processing season is a short one, there are considerable stocks of sugar throughout the year in the hands of processors, refiners, importers, speculators, and dealers. The Department is subject, therefore, to continuous pressure, in direct and indirect form, to utilize whatever power these interested parties believe it to possess to enhance the inventory value of such stocks. As of January 1, the total value of the visible supply of sugar alone is about \$170,000,000, and a quarter of a cent increase would mean \$10,000,000 additional to the owners of such sugars. The Congress, however, embodied in the Sugar Act certain standards limiting the discretion of the Secretary in fixing consumers' requirements.

It has been the policy of the Department to administer the provisions of the act in accordance with such standards and for the benefit of domestic producers and with protection to the conflicting interests of other groups affected by the act.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. WALLACE, *Secretary.*

EXTENSIONS IN THE RECORD

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot submit that request without the consent of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES]. Is it agreeable to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. BOLLES. It is, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, for some days there has been a controversy in the House which has operated to keep certain articles out of the Appendix of the RECORD. Of course, whether or not that has been for or against the general public good, I would not undertake to say. The controversy was precipitated last Friday when I offered for the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON]. At the time it was suggested to me by a Member on the floor, prior to the subsequent objection, that the article was a long article. I replied that I thought it would take about two pages of the RECORD. Subsequently there was objection.

I offered that article for the RECORD in good faith. I have been in Congress 4 years, and during all of that time I have observed that articles and statements, radio speeches, and other matters, written and given by Members of the House themselves, their own words, have not been objected to for the RECORD.

The ostensible reason for the objection was the length of the article. Then, too, somewhere along the line there has been a suggestion that there is a distinction between an article written for a periodical and a speech made over the radio. As far as I am concerned this is a distinction without a difference, because on many occasions I have seen radio speeches delivered by Members of the House subsequently reprinted in newspapers and periodicals. Such speeches have been inserted in the RECORD without objection. The medium through which the statement is first made is of no consequence.

So we get down to the matter of the length of this article. It was suggested yesterday by a Member on two different occasions in two different places that this was an eight-page article. Just that we may keep the record straight, the article in the periodical referred to occupies parts of four pages. In order, however, that there may be no question in the minds of the Members as to the actual length of the article and the space it would take in the RECORD, I submitted it to the assistant superintendent of planning at the Government Printing Office for information as to how much space it would take in the RECORD. I was informed that it would take not to exceed two and one-fourth pages. I do not know whence comes this talk about eight pages, or the extreme length of the article, because I see in the RECORD this morning a reprint of a speech delivered on the floor of the House 2 years ago, a speech heretofore contained in the RECORD, reprinted this morning to a length of five pages.

I said that I offered this article in good faith. Since offering it I have inquired of the Committee on Printing as to the

length of articles that may be inserted without an estimate of the cost being obtained and found that it was two and one-half pages. This article, Mr. Speaker, will not take two and one-half pages.

Mr. Speaker, this article in all of its paragraphs and parts may not be the expression of views with which Members agree. Many things have been put in the RECORD with which I did not agree. There are some things in this article with which I do not altogether agree.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. The fact of the matter is that this is a well-written, well-thought-out, well-considered article by a Member of this House. It deals with current social, political, and economic questions. It deals with problems that are before the House and the country. If there ever has been anything produced by a Member of the House that justified its insertion in the RECORD, this is such an article.

In all fairness, and in order that we may not engage in further controversy that can do nothing but close the pages of the RECORD to some Members, I ask again, Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the article to which I have referred written by our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I see that the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] is not on the floor. He is detained in committee, I understand. I trust the gentleman from Indiana will renew his request when the gentleman from California is on the floor.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the other day I spoke with the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] and based on that conversation, I may say to the House that I am confident if he were here he would not object to the offer of this article.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman withhold his request until I can communicate with the gentleman by telephone?

Mr. HALLECK. I shall be glad to.

Mr. RAYBURN. I personally have no objection to the article, but I know the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] has objected twice.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request for the time being.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks just now made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts has objected—

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I recognize fully the fact that this House, closely representing the people of the Nation, has no prerogative in determining who shall fill major or minor offices of the Government—no power of confirmation. But we are deeply, vitally interested in what manner of men are named to those offices. We cannot all be carried away by the soporific sophistications of the man at the other end of the Avenue or the tintinnabulations of easy-flowing sonorous sentences. We must face facts.

A man has been named to the Interstate Commerce Commission who is committed not only to public ownership of transportation lines, but to revolutionary changes in the Government which would put us on a plane with a Marxian Socialist government, did he have his way. That man is honest in his beliefs. That is the pitiable part of it, and into this great Commission Thomas R. Amlie will carry those

ideas frequently expressed on the floor of this House, in his honest zeal for the destruction of the purpose for which the very agency of government on which, if confirmed, he will serve and advocate the erection of something new, hostile, and different. The I. C. C. believes in privately owned lines. Mr. Amlie does not believe in privately owned lines.

I cannot remain silent at such a time. My district in Wisconsin, which was Mr. Amlie's district, and which overwhelmingly repudiated the political philosophy of Mr. Amlie, will expect me to make protest; my people will expect it; my State will expect it. The Nation will eventually expect it—demand it.

This is not a question of personal integrity. It is a question of placing a man in one of the great independent agencies of the Government to administer its affairs and sit in judgment on technical questions of transportation, with opinions, expressed in advance, hostile to the established order of our Government. It is a paradoxical situation which we seldom meet—that a man so mentally out of harmony with a job could be given cheering assistance from the appointing power.

From the lips of Mr. Amlie come his own condemnation. He advocates:

First. A change in government.

Second. Confiscation of wealth by taxation.

Third. Government ownership of all industry, business, and every operation, with practical confiscation of all productive private property.

Fourth. Setting up of a great agency which is to practically and actually succeed the present Government insofar as its economic policy is concerned. The only thing left unmentioned is the police powers of the United States Government.

And this man has been named as a member of a great Commission, an independent unit of government in this Nation. I say to you, and every patriotic citizen must agree, that a man with that political philosophy has no place in our coordinated Government under the Constitution and the flag. That philosophy belongs overseas where Karl Marx and his manifesto are the fundamental law.

I call attention of the House to a speech made by Thomas R. Amlie, of the First Congressional District of Wisconsin, in the Seventy-fourth Congress, recorded on page 10037 and subsequent pages of the RECORD, as an index to the thought, principles, and purposes of the man nominated on Monday, January 23, for high office in the Interstate Commerce Commission.

As a man thinketh so is he.

We know that the Interstate Commerce Commission is one of the Government's most powerful in our bureaucracy. The destiny of millions of vested capital are in the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The destiny of nearly a million employees and their families are wrapped up in this Commission. The life or death of a transportation system is bound up in this Commission. It calls for skillful experience and some technical knowledge beyond the restricted confines of a small-town lawyer's office.

To say that this appointment came as a shock to thousands of friends of President Roosevelt in Wisconsin is to speak in whispers. I do not speak lightly when I say this. The Democratic State Committee of Wisconsin has already protested. Mr. Amlie has the right of his own opinions, but when they run not only counter to but in fixed opposition to the Constitution and public policy, especially in relation to the very task given him by the President, a position and responsibility so foreign to all his declared commitments to completed public ownership and the perfected Marxian production for use to be applied to America, we cannot help but register a shock.

Was there no Democrat of outstanding ability for this office? Was there no Republican like Balthasar Meyer in the State or Nation, or no Progressive?

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman. I desire to make a correction, however. A Democrat cannot be appointed to this office.

Mr. BOLLES. The Commission is already overmanned by Democrats.

Mr. RAYBURN. Not overmanned; no.

Mr. BOLLES. Are there not seven Democrats on that Commission now?

Mr. RAYBURN. No; only six, and that is all there can be from any one party.

Mr. BOLLES. I know that. The statute so provides.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. To keep the record straight, may I say the law has been violated already. There are now seven Democrats. Mr. Eastman was appointed by President Hoover, according to the newspapers, on December 18, 1929, as a Democrat; so there are now seven Democrats. Mr. Amlie is a Democrat. He supported President Roosevelt in his two Presidential campaigns.

Mr. RAYBURN. There were a great many people who were not Democrats did that. Mr. Eastman has never been classed as a Democrat, and he does not class himself as a Democrat. He classes himself as an independent.

Mr. BOLLES. In Wisconsin Mr. Amlie is not even recognized as a Progressive of standing. He belongs to the extreme left wing. His own party defeated him in the primary in which he ran for United States Senator.

I want to read here in this RECORD the speech to which I referred in my opening sentences:

If, however—

Said Mr. Amlie—

We are to consider the nature of an adequate constitutional amendment, it seems to me that it would be well to consider what further power, if any, ought to be incorporated in an amendment designed to grant to the United States Congress powers sufficiently broad to permit an adequate consideration of economic conditions by the representatives of the people. I should like to suggest, therefore, for your consideration an amendment substantially as follows:

HUMAN-RIGHTS AMENDMENT

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in order to permit Congress, as the elected representatives of the people of the United States, to take action necessary to bring to the people of the Nation the abundance which full-capacity use of its natural resources, its machinery of production, and the skill of its people make possible, the following amendment to the Constitution, to be designated as the human-rights amendment, be, and is hereby, proposed to the States to become a valid part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in the several States as provided in the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Congress shall have the power to enact laws providing for the ownership, operation, and management, through instrumentalities of the Government of the United States, of business, manufacturing, commerce, industry, and banking, and shall have the power to purchase, or condemn by eminent domain, such enterprises.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have the power to regulate, limit, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age; to regulate hours and conditions of labor and to establish minimum wages in any employment; to regulate production, industry, trade, and commerce; to provide for the support of children, mothers, aged, sick, and other persons not gainfully employed in the form of periodic grants, pensions, benefits, compensation, and indemnities from the Public Treasury or through contributions; and to provide for the economic and social welfare of the people of the United States.

"SEC. 3. Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes on gains, profits, and income derived from securities issued either before or after the ratification of this amendment under the authority of the United States, the authority of any of the several States, and the authority of any subsidiary government of any State, including municipalities, as well as the right to make direct levies on capital.

"SEC. 4. Nothing contained in the fifth or the fourteenth amendments to this Constitution relative to the taking of property without due process of law shall be construed to impose any limitation on the legislative power of Congress and the several States with respect to any of the subjects referred to in this article."

Mr. Amlie explains that—

This would give to the Federal Government the power to set up agencies for the production and distribution of goods and services to the citizens of the United States.

Substitute "Stalin" for "Federal Government" and put the statement in the past tense and we have the Soviet Republics in operation.

That was in the Seventy-fourth Congress. I have not here time to carry my indictment into further counts. But in support of his position Mr. Amlie quotes a number of New Deal agencies which he says has in part carried out these schemes of control. Here is the fantastic plan of taxation in order to carry out the idea which is uppermost in Mr. Amlie's mind, sharing the wealth. But as a simple method he proposes that Congress spend billions on divers and sundry things, and from the RECORD I quote as to payment:

POWER TO INFLATE

In order to pay for this spending Congress may impose taxes of a kind that would absorb all income above a certain point. Congress might also levy excise taxes that would virtually take from certain sections of the people most of their present income, or if this should fail, there is then no limit on the extent to which this Government might borrow, and if people should finally become unwilling to buy Government securities, then the Government could simply take over the Federal Reserve System, causing the Treasury to issue securities which the Federal Reserve System would buy at par. In other words, the Congress and President have the power to embark on a program of pure inflation if they should ever desire to do so. If they so desire they could issue fiat money to any extent that they might choose.

In still further confirmation of the Amlie position, let me further quote from the RECORD in the Seventy-fifth Congress, when Mr. Amlie was further expounding his views:

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman thinks we can continue to spend beyond our income for 20 years without endangering our financial structure?

Mr. AMLIE. Yes; I think so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the gentleman believes that one who conscientiously inquires where the money is coming from is a calamity howler?

Mr. AMLIE. Yes; I would class him as such, particularly when he states squarely that the country is going to run into bankruptcy, internal disorder, and every other calamity unless we immediately balance the Budget. I feel, if we come to a national calamity, the shortest way will be not by spending but by following the gentleman's advice to immediately balance the Federal Budget.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AMLIE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I have great respect for the gentleman's view and judgment, although I do not agree with him. Am I correct in stating that the gentleman is a disciple of that philosophy which calls for doing away with the profit system in this country, that the gentleman believes in production for use and not for profit, and that if he had his way he would change the economic system of this Nation?

Mr. AMLIE. I believe we are moving to a point where the economic system will be changed. For 20 years I have expressed my views on this and tried to get the American people to agree with me. I am not speaking now, however, from the standpoint of advocating a change from an economic system driven by the profit motive to one driven by a production-for-use motive. I am merely stating what I conceive to be the course of wisdom here and now operating within the framework of the present economic system.

Mr. MICHENER. Knowing the gentleman as I do, and the sincerity of his belief in his doctrine, I know the gentleman would naturally encourage and do anything which would eventually terminate in the type of government he wants to see in this country.

Mr. AMLIE. No; that is not fair.

Mr. MICHENER. Therefore, the gentleman favors the present system because he believes it leads directly to a result which will bring about this new kind of a government he wants.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Amlie was a Member of the House, from the district which I now have the honor to represent, for 6 years. The gentleman came from North Dakota, where he was an able speaker and proselyter for the Non-Partisan League and the Townley system, now long laid away in the catacombs of ancient political history. The people got tired of horse-liniment theories. They wanted something else.

It reminds me of a delegation that visited a certain colored preacher and asked him to resign. A member of the delegation said, "If you ask us why, we want to tell you. You argue, you sputter, you discourse, all O. K., but what this here congregation wants to know is whereas and wherein." We began over in Wisconsin to find out "whereas" and "wherein" and from that comes the Republican delegation from that State.

The people of my district have risen in arms, they have held mass meetings, and have agreed to come down to Wash-

ington to protest to the Senate and to the President himself the appointment of a man who does not believe in our system of government, who does not believe in the profit system, who does not believe that the railroads ought to be operated privately. The one job to which he would be appointed is to administer the privately owned railroads, and the people want somebody on that Commission who realizes fully the responsibilities that they have rather than to use their position in order to proselyte for some new and strange doctrine in the United States, transplanted here from the mind and brain of Karl Marx.

[Here the gavel fell.]

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may have permission to sit during the sessions of the House during the session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article written by our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON] entitled "After Roosevelt, What?"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] may have permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I now have permission to address the House today for 10 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that this time may be extended to 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today at the conclusion of such other special orders as may have been heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the resignation of former Attorney General Homer Cummings, and to include therein a speech made by Max Spelke.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, in an extension of remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], that very distinguished gentleman asked, "What is the matter with New England?"

Mr. Speaker, I have the very highest regard for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] and I have always been of the opinion that he means to be fair. However, in the article mentioned above if the gentleman meant to be fair his ideas and facts are really very confused. He speaks in the first place of the matter of timber salvage and the payments to be made to the timbermen for the purchase of their logs as

a purely local matter. The gentleman entirely overlooks the fact, however, that the timber market of the entire country would be seriously affected and also the consumers of the entire country would be affected if this were not done.

I very much resent, Mr. Speaker, the implication in the gentleman's remarks that the New England timber people have not shown the courage, the fortitude, and the independence they have shown during every calamity in New England, and the fortitude, the independence, and the resourcefulness the people of New England showed at the very beginning of our country's history.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. If I had known when I reverted to my old newspaper habit of writing an article for publication that I would have brought down upon my head the castigation of my very esteemed friend the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, I doubt very much that I would have written the article. My whole purpose in writing it was to point out that in my opinion the country had gone crazy on spending, and that at last New England has gone crazy with the rest of the country.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I assure the gentleman that New England has not gone crazy, and is very much standing on her feet and using her head in this matter because it is so vital to the entire country as well as to New England.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman to wait until I have completed my statement? I am very eager to place the facts in the Record.

In justice to the gentleman from Indiana I may say that in reading over the hearings again I realize that perhaps we did not stress enough the damage to the timber market of the entire country, so perhaps the gentleman did not get that picture.

I have a very high regard for the gentleman from Indiana. I recall that years ago as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and as chairman of its subcommittee on hospitals I believed the gentleman had such a good cause in asking for a hospital at Indianapolis that I did everything in my power to help him.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thought providing such a hospital would be of benefit to the veterans in that section of the country, and it affected the entire country as well. I know the gentleman means to be fair. I have stated before that I have always had that belief. I have a very high regard for the gentleman. However, I cannot let this matter pass without comment.

No loans are being made by the Northeastern Timber Salvage Administration to the timber owners in New England. Loans are made by the Disaster Loan Corporation to the Salvage Administration for the purpose of carrying on the salvage work. The purchase agreement made with timber owners provides for advance payment, at one time 80 percent of the log value and now 90 percent. Any further payments will be made pro rata at the end of the timber operation if there is a surplus over all costs of administration and marketing.

The gentleman unjustly did not bring out in his article the fact that this is a business arrangement. It is in no sense a grant. The logs are to be purchased and paid for, value received. There will be no loss to the Federal Government through this procedure. Interest will be paid by the Timber Salvage Corporation to the Disaster Loan Corporation, so there will be no loss to the Disaster Loan Corporation in any way.

The Salvage Administration's operation is in no sense a relief measure. It is true it is an attempt to recover for the New England farmer some of the great wealth destroyed by the hurricane of September, but fundamentally it is a business operation that is being carried on. Logs are not being bought indiscriminately; for both the hardwoods and the softwoods there have been established three grades, with

exact specifications. These grades cover only the quality logs from which high-grade lumber can be manufactured. The logs are accepted at designated delivery points, leaving to the owner or his contractor the logging and hauling. The price schedules that have been set for the logs were arrived at by comprehensive studies made by Government experts and represent approximately the average price paid for logs in the commercial market over a period of 3 years previous to the hurricane. If the farmer was paid the full schedule price for his logs it would not give him the stumpage value he received before the hurricane, because the cost of logging the fallen timber lying in a tangled mass is estimated to be from \$2 to \$3 a thousand board feet more than logging standing timber.

It is estimated that there is about 4,000,000,000 feet of fallen timber in the hurricane area. Of this approximately 1,600,000,000 feet is salvageable. This represents about 5 years' supply for the sawmills of New England. Before the Salvage Administration began buying logs, sawmill operators were offering timber owners from 25 to 75 cents a thousand board feet as stumpage prices for the fallen logs. Logs bought at such a price could be manufactured into lumber, which, if thrown on the market in quantities, would have broken the lumber market in New England. The effect would have extended far beyond the New England market. After fulfilling the requirements of the New England market at disaster prices the markets of New York and the Middle Atlantic States could have had cut-rate lumber dumped into them, producing disturbing effects on the markets of the entire Atlantic seaboard.

The Members of the House must realize perfectly what the dumping of all this lumber on the market would mean. The timber people would have to sell their logs at a tremendous loss today, and this would disrupt the timber market. Then, if the procedure we have suggested were not followed, later the price of lumber would go so high the cost of building, of making boxes, and so forth, would be prohibitive. You can imagine the effect that would have all over the country.

This is a great national problem, not just our own local New England problem. I am very sorry if we of New England have not made this situation clear to the Members before this, but possibly this is because we were so impressed by the enormity of the disaster and know it so well we believed other people must know about it also. This was the worst hurricane and the most serious disaster of its type that has ever taken place in the world, according to the experts, but perhaps we did not make that fact entirely clear to all the Members. It is obvious the gentleman from Indiana also did not realize the seriousness of the problem.

It must be remembered that 45 percent of New England's consumption is home produced and that 55 percent comes from other regions. Alabama, Florida, and Georgia supply 4.7 percent; Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas, 4 percent; while from Oregon and Washington come 22 percent. These figures are for the year 1936 and are the last compilation of lumber consumption. All of these regions would have felt the effect of any break in lumber prices on the northeastern coast. It is the purpose of the Salvage Administration to prevent any such consequences. It is storing softwood logs in ponds, or where that is impossible, processing the logs immediately into graded lumber and storing it. Hardwood logs are being processed as rapidly as possible and the lumber stored. The logs and the lumber will be fed into the market at a rate which will prevent any disturbance of prices.

Let me say again to the gentleman from Indiana and to the Members of the House that the only wood to be purchased by the Timber Salvage Corporation through Surplus Commodities Corporation is marketable wood, wood that can be sold in the markets, wood that can be merchandised. From the gentleman's article one might infer that people are to be paid for any kind of wood they have, whether or not it is saleable in the ordinary and usual sense of the word.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes, if the gentleman from Connecticut, who has been granted permission to address the House at this time, has no objection.

Mr. MILLER. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman from Connecticut is also interested in this problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROMJUE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In the opinion of conservative mill and lumber operators in New England there is only a normal business risk in the operation. With the acceleration of construction in the New England area lumber prices have stiffened with every likelihood that within the next few years there will be some increase in prices.

As administrative costs are being kept to a minimum for effective handling of the operation even if there should be no increase in lumber prices the operation should be self-liquidating at the very least.

The timber-salvage operation is in no sense a relief measure. Logs are not being bought indiscriminately. They are mostly hardwoods and softwoods, of three grades, with exact specifications.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from Massachusetts yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. I know the gentlewoman from Massachusetts wants to be entirely fair.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I certainly do.

Mr. LUDLOW. And I am sure she knows my high regard, and, indeed, my affection and esteem for her.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And I have the same feeling toward the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. And I appreciate what she did for me in the instance to which she formerly referred.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was delighted to do so; it was only a matter of justice.

Mr. LUDLOW. And I do not want to be put in the attitude of any seeming criticism of the delegation in Congress from New England, because I did not have any such feeling.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I interrupt there to say that I felt the gentleman meant to pay a tribute, perhaps, in getting away with something. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUDLOW. And I may say, as of course, we all know, there is no abler delegation in this Congress from any section than the delegation from New England, and I sat in at all of that meeting and I believe I never heard a case more ably presented; but what have we here? A new and a strange philosophy, that any time an act of God injures anybody we are to step into the United States Treasury and make him whole. [Applause.]

I am sorry that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts thought she detected between the lines of my article an implication that I did not appreciate the tragic position in which the farmers of New England are placed as a result of the hurricane. I was born and raised on a farm at a time when many sections of our State had barely emerged from the wilderness and the good people from whom I sprang had more than their share of the hardships, the tragedies, and the heart-rending disappointments of farm life. God never made any better people than my pioneer father and mother, and I would be untrue to their memory if I did not have the broadest and sincerest sympathy for those who seek to wrest a living from the soil. When the gentlewoman from Massachusetts a few moments ago referred to the courage and fortitude of the New England farmers the golden strands of memory led me back to the little country graveyard in Indiana where my father and mother sleep. They, too, were courageous. They, too, were brave; and anyone who thinks I do not sympathize with the New England farmers does not know me. Of course, I sympathize with them with all my heart and with all my understanding.

But I am concerned—more concerned than I can express—over the trend of things in this country. We are piling up a national debt that is simply staggering to the imagination. We have turned our back on local initiative and local responsibility and we now look to a centralized Government at Washington to do everything and to the Federal Treasury to pay all the bills. It is a most unwholesome trend of government and, painful as the process may be, it would be better for everybody, including the farmers of New England, if we would redirect our footsteps to safer ground. We can no more repeal the laws of economics than we can repeal the laws of nature, and one of the laws of economics is that we cannot go on forever with a deficit of \$4,000,000,000 a year. If we make the farmers of one section of our country whole on their blown-down logs every citizen who suffers from a calamity for which he is not responsible would have an equal right to make a similar claim on the United States Treasury. Into what depths of involvement would such a doctrine lead us?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But in this case it is simply a purchasing matter and the Federal Government will receive back every penny. It is not a charity or a gift or a grant to New England in any way.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKE] may have 30 minutes to address the House at the conclusion of the legislative business and other special orders on Monday of next week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROMJUE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter addressed by myself to Colonel Fechner, the head of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein remarks of Senator TOWNSEND of Delaware regarding the silver question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made a short time ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, in this House I have the honor to represent the First Congressional District of the State of Connecticut. Within that district lies the city of Hartford, the capital city of Connecticut. The district runs from the Massachusetts-Connecticut line south to a point 7 miles below Hartford, and spreads east and west from the Connecticut River. The people of that district are vitally interested in the problem of flood control and flood prevention. This afternoon I am going to talk about flood control in an effort to present to you the point of view of a citizen residing in the flood-affected area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at this whole proposition for what it is. Twice, in 1936 and again in 1938, flood waters swept buildings away; the lives of men, women, and children were menaced; factories were flooded; warehouses became swirling pools of turbulent waters; property was destroyed. This project, far from being partisan in itself is

nonpartisan—if there has ever been such a thing as a nonpartisan issue before Congress. We are talking now, if you please, in the terms of human lives—the lives of men, women, and children. We are talking now, if you please, in the terms of factories which give employment. We are talking now in terms of property owned by citizens, property which represents their all—the accumulation of a lifetime of effort.

Now, let us see what happens. In other parts of this country the Government has been so eager to establish flood control and, properly so, that it has even used the excuse of navigability. And yet, when this project comes up we find objections being voiced. Somebody objects to putting on paper what is conceded to be a verbal agreement as between the Federal and State officials.

What objection can there be to a contract, setting forth in plain words, what the terms and conditions are to be? Is it not true that the only possible safeguard against misunderstanding and against misconstruction and distortions of verbal agreements is a written contract? Some object to the paragraph in the proposed contract which says:

In order to carry out the provisions of the foregoing acts as to the particular project herein mentioned, it is agreed between the State of Vermont and the Chief of Engineers without prejudice to the rights of the State of Vermont with respect to any other proceedings under the cited act of Congress.

And so forth. Now, since the administration objects to that clause, would it not be a simple fairness for the administration to say what other right of the State of Vermont it intends or contemplates violating. After all, this is a union of States. It is not a new form of government that sets up a rivalry between the Federal Government and the State government as to the execution of the rights of a State. The Federal Government ought to be the very first to want to protect any State in its rights. It is not enough for officials of the Government to say they do not know what this paragraph means. One might observe that the administration has enough legal talent on its pay rolls to advise these gentlemen on this point.

Again I say, let us look at this proposition for exactly what it is worth. What a strange contradiction we have here. How all the lofty sentiment about caring for the unfortunate; feeding the ill-fed; clothing the ill-clothed; sheltering the ill-housed vanishes when this proposition comes up—of saving the lives of men, women, and children; of saving the factories which offer them the hope of employment and wages; of protecting the property which represents their life savings. Why is it that all the noble sentiment of the administration seems to vanish and all the deep concern for the lives and welfare and jobs of the people become a secondary consideration in this case?

Is it, Mr. Speaker, is it because the administration wants to shove down the throats of these people a power project to constitute what my respected friend from Mississippi designated as a yardstick? Is it the fact that this administration is willing to qualify its concern for the lives and safety and health, the jobs and property of these men, women, and children of this particular section of the United States by its desire to establish another little T. V. A.? What other conclusion can we reach than this?

It may interest this House to know that Governor Baldwin, of Connecticut, told me, within the last few days, that four of the private power dams which have been washed away are not going to be replaced by the power companies because there is now a surplus of dams in that section. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the administration wants to continue its insistence upon seven Federal power projects, referred to in the last Congress as the "seven little T. V. A.'s," let the administration come fairly before Congress and ask for what it wants and let that question be decided upon its merits; but I plead with this House, and I plead with the President, not to make the lives and safety and jobs and property of the people the price of establishment of a little T. V. A.

Undoubtedly, within a few days, I will be accused of being a tool of a so-called Power Trust; but let me say to the Mem-

bers of this House, I do not own nor have I ever owned a single share of stock in any power company. I have no friends in the power business unless it be a few pick-swinging, pole-climbing employees. My only interest in this matter is to do whatever I can to see that the residents of my district receive some protection from future floods.

It is not impossible that you who have dealt with this problem over a period of years should allow your personal animosities to affect your judgment. You will all agree with me that to a new Member of Congress many of the things that take place here are strange. It certainly was surprising to me last week to hear a Member from Mississippi address the House during a discussion of an appropriation bill providing money to clean up the damage caused by the recent hurricane, spend all of his time tossing a few darts at the Governor of Vermont and referring to other things that had no connection with hurricane damage.

Why is there so much interest in trying to save money for residents of my district? If there is one characteristic of the people of New England that has stood out over the years, it is their willingness and ability to save an honest dollar. These various angles were discussed during the last campaign; they will not be news to the people of my district. My predecessor came back to Connecticut last summer claiming credit for defeating the New England flood-control compact. He raised the Power Trust cry. He broadcast on the subject Lobby Over Congress, and when the campaign was over a 36,000 Democratic plurality of the 2 years previous had been turned into a 4,000 Republican plurality, or a turn-over of almost 20 percent of the votes cast.

I am not here to defend any public utility—that there have been abuses in that field we all know. That dishonest men have engaged in the power business we all know. There are dishonest men in other industries, and recent history proves that dishonest men have even engaged in politics.

For one, I am rather proud of the Hartford Electric Light Co. It treats its employees well; it has reduced its rates voluntarily as consumption increased; there are hundreds of small stockholders who have invested their savings in the stock of that company who now look to its dividends for a livelihood.

I am convinced that the people of my district do not want to see public ownership. We do not want to see the Government compete with private industry. We cherish our freedom and liberty.

Now, just a brief review of flood-control history in Connecticut. Following the 1936 flood the citizens of my district demanded protection from future floods. They were willing to pay for that protection. Congress enacted legislation providing that where reservoirs had to be built in one State for the protection of citizens, in other States they could enter into a compact and under certain conditions submit the compact to Congress for approval. That method was adopted in New England. A nonpartisan commission was appointed to draw up the compact. They did their work well. The compact was approved by the legislatures concerned, signed by the Governors of the New England States, some of whom were Republicans, some Democrats. I do not know all the members of the commission that drew up that compact, but I know the Connecticut members. They were outstanding men, honest and able. They had just one thought in mind, and that was flood control. That compact finally came down here. Congress refused to approve it because it contained what was alleged to be a "power joker."

I am not a lawyer, but I can read English, and as a rule can understand what I read. I have never been able to find the alleged "power joker." That compact stated in substance that certain land was to be leased to a flood-control commission for the purpose of providing flood control, and to make it emphatic it further stated "and for flood control only." A lot has been said about the fact that the lease was to run for 99 years. I am told that originally the term of 99 years was mentioned, until it was pointed out by the Democratic Attorney General of Connecticut, Mr. Daly, that 99 years was a short time in the life of a Nation, therefore the longer

term was inserted. In another place the compact stated: "Any power inherent in these reservoirs is hereby reserved to the several States," which to me means only one thing—you cannot reserve something to a State unless it be something that State already possessed. That being true, the question of future power development was left right where it was before the compact was written.

It is interesting to recall that in the campaign of 1936 President Roosevelt spoke in Bushnell Park, Hartford. While speaking to a vast audience he complimented the representatives of the New England States for the way they had gone ahead with the compact idea as suggested by Congress. He further said, in substance, that you can spend all the money you want building dikes in Hartford, but you will not have solved the problem of flood control until you enter into a compact with your neighboring States to the north. Why and when did the President change his mind? Now, we come to 1939, and the residents of Hartford County have no more protection than they had in 1936.

Dikes are being built on both sides of the Connecticut River at Hartford and East Hartford. These dikes will create a natural narrows which will, according to Army engineers, increase the crest of a flood north of that point; but we were told that the three reservoirs for which money has been allocated would more than offset that rise of the river. However, if these reservoirs should not be built, because of the present controversy, we are worse off than ever before.

If the 1938 amendment is not clear, why was it not submitted to a proper tribunal? It has been reported within the past week that the President himself stated that he is not certain that the Federal Government has the right to take land without the States' consent. At the same time, the President stated further that he could recall no occasion when the Government had taken land from a State without its approval. We must bear in mind that land taken for post offices, lighthouses, public parks, and such uses have always met with State approval. Why not evict the "Ethiopian gentleman" from this wood pile? Mr. RANKIN has stated in the RECORD:

If you will let us alone, we will develop the water power of New England.

I should like to say to Mr. RANKIN that we are not interested at this time in developing water power for electricity—what we want is flood prevention and flood control. Let us forget politics. Let no one take an arbitrary stand and say, "You will get flood control on my terms or you won't get it at all." Flood protection can be provided within the Constitution without taking from any State, rights the State have always had and without injecting the power issue. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DUTY ON BINDER TWINE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I introduced in the House today a bill to place binder twine manufactured in foreign countries on the dutiable list and fix the amount of the tariff or duty at 2 cents a pound. I do this knowing full well that this item has been on the free list since 1894. The manufacture of binder twine by private producers of this country has decreased more than 50 percent since 1925; and if the present trend continues, it will be but a very short time when there will be no more binder twine manufactured in the United States and this industry will have gone the way of some other industries—vanished entirely from this country.

I realize this subject is of vital interest to every Member of this House who comes from a grain-producing State. It is also of vital interest to every Member of this House where binder twine is manufactured in this country. It is also of vital interest to the Members of this House who come from the eight States of the Union where binder twine is manufactured in their penal institutions.

My State of Michigan happens to be one of the eight States in the Union where binder twine is manufactured. The subject has been called to my attention by the department of

correction of Michigan. With an investment of nearly \$1,000,000 in the binder-twine plant of our penal institution—and if am not as much concerned about what is produced by convict labor as I am concerned about what is produced or manufactured by the free labor of our country—this department shows that within the last few years the number of men employed has decreased from 259 to 143, with the prospect, as the department has said in its letter to me, that within a very short time Michigan will lose its entire investment in this plant at Jackson, Mich. This is situated in the district of my distinguished colleague Mr. MICHENER. If the present policy is continued, it may be compelled to close its doors and the investment will be lost to the people of my State.

The record shows that in 1925 binder twine was produced in this country to the extent of 290,000,000 pounds—and I simply use the round numbers for the sake of brevity—while in 1935, 10 years later, the amount produced in this country was only 158,000,000 pounds, or, as I have said, a decrease of nearly 50 percent.

The amount produced by convict labor in all penal institutions was 56,000,000 pounds in 1925 and in 1935, 10 years later, 48,000,000 pounds, or a reduction of practically one-seventh of the amount, while in private industry it has been reduced from 234,000,000 pounds in 1925 to 109,000,000 pounds in 1935, or about 50 percent. In the same period we find that the amount of imports of binder twine from foreign countries has increased from 11,000,000 pounds in 1925 to 56,000,000 pounds in 1935. In other words, from 4.5 percent of what was consumed in this country in 1925 to 27 percent in 1935, or an increase of 85 percent in the amount of importations. The most of it comes from Mexico. I have some figures here which I shall ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD in the extension of my remarks. The amount produced in 1925 by private industry for domestic consumption was 72.7 percent of all of the amount used in this country. That has been reduced to 49.4 percent in 1935, while the amount of imports, as I have shown, have increased from 4.5 to 27.1 percent. Within the last 2 or 3 years I recall distinctly that what I am attempting to do by this bill we did in the case of sugar. On the floor of this House a very heated debate arose over the question of permitting Cuba to ship into this country more refined sugar than she had shipped before. It was argued if that was done the American refineries on the Atlantic seaboard would close their doors and men employed in that industry, many thousands of them, would be thrown out of work and compelled to seek employment elsewhere. Members who were here then will remember that we defeated that proposal. There may arise in the minds of Members from the grain-producing States the question whether this will increase the cost of binder twine to the farmer. My answer to that question is that if the trend in this country continues until all manufacture of binder twine ceases in the United States the farmers of this country will be at the mercy of foreign manufacturers and be compelled to pay whatever price is fixed by them. My hope and my belief is that if we can restore or save for this Nation the manufacture of that one product, at least to the extent of our own domestic consumption, we can raise the volume to a point where the amount of the duty on foreign manufactured binder twine will be absorbed and the price of binder twine will not be increased to the American farmer. The price will be reduced by the increase of the amount manufactured.

I call attention to the fact that this bill in no way prevents the importation of raw materials for the manufacture of that article in this country. It simply applies to the manufactured product in other countries. It may be a surprise to many to know that you can buy Mexican binder twine, and I mean by that binder twine manufactured in Mexico by Mexican labor, for less than you can buy the raw material in the United States. I have a telegram from the Director of Corrections of the State of Michigan which reads in part as follows:

It appears that there is no fixed selling price on foreign binder twine. Owing to profusion of foreign twine available in this

country, sellers are allowing buyers to name price. It also appears that much foreign twine is being held by banks and other moneyed interests who are anxious to dispose of the stock in order to liquidate. Mexican twine is quoted at a less figure than Mexican raw materials can be purchased by domestic manufacturers, due we suspect to the fact that finished twine is not taxed by Mexican Government while raw materials for export are taxed.

It is my information that foreign manufacturers of binder twine wait until the price is fixed by the American manufacturer, and then sell for 1 cent a pound less to the American consumer. That policy means the ultimate extinction of our domestic manufacturer in the production of this particular article.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. Would not also the relief mentioned by the gentleman be a tremendous help to the cotton grower?

Mr. DONDERO. I have not given consideration to that subject, but I do have in mind the question of keeping our own people employed as long as possible. If this particular industry vanishes, we will have that many more people unemployed. May I say, for the benefit of the House, that in the month of June 1938, there was imported more than 18,000,000 pounds of binder twine into this country, while last year over 80,000,000 pounds were imported duty free.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What the gentleman has said about the extinction of the manufacture of binder twine in this country is also true with respect to the manufacture of newsprint paper. All the plants engaged in that manufacture were forced out of business because of the importation of foreign made newsprint paper, made by foreign labor, which threw thousands of people out of work in this country.

Mr. DONDERO. And with which American labor cannot compete.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan for calling this matter to the attention of the country, because it is important to the people of the district which I represent, and if I can cooperate with the gentleman in any way I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

I do not think it is overdrawn to say that if we are going to protect sugar refineries of this country and keep men employed in those factories, there is no reason why we should not keep American labor employed in American factories for the manufacture of binder twine so greatly needed by the grain-producing farmers of this Nation.

I am well aware that in some sections of the country where combines have come into use in place of the binder, binder twine is not used because the grain is cut and threshed in the field. I understand there are about 35,000 combines in use now. However, that does not apply in other sections of the country where combines cannot be and are not used. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a radio address I delivered on last Friday night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record

LXXXIV—54

by including a speech which I delivered at the Farmers' Equity National Union Convention in St. Francis, Kans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include therewith certain charts and diagrams disclosing the facts and figures in reference to the importation of farm products, and the American acres displaced thereby.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE SUGAR-BEET INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, during the war this country was insufficiently supplied with sugar. Prior to the war we had not developed the domestic beet-sugar industry to a point where it could supply a reasonable percentage of our sugar requirements. In 1913, we must remember, the administration then in power and led by President Wilson reduced the duty on sugar coming to this country from Cuba. This discouraged the growth of the industry, and our people were afraid to invest their savings in the industry for fear it would eventually be crushed by reason of competition from the low-cost areas in Cuba and other foreign lands. Following the war Cuba greatly expanded her sugar industry in actual production, and as a direct result of this expansion plus the rapid recovery in actual production of the beet-sugar industry of western European countries and the creation of a highly protected and subsidized sugar-beet industry in the British Islands, the expansion of the industry in the United States was further discouraged.

REPUBLICAN ENCOURAGEMENT IN 1930

However, in 1930 the administration then in power enacted a protective tariff of \$2 per 100 pounds on raw sugar coming in from Cuba. Since 1930 the domestic American industry has been expanding its production of actual sugar. This added protection was encouragement, and we should add it to the further inducement for growing sugar beets because of the protection of the Tariff Act of 1930 and the participating sugar-beet contracts put into operation by the industry in 1932, under which farmers were able to grow sugar beets on a basis more profitable than other substitute crops would bring in the way of cash income at the prices prevailing in 1932 and 1933. During the years 1932 and 1933, by reason of sugar being a nonsurplus crop, the farmers in the sugar-beet factory areas found the industry to be of great benefit. As a matter of fact, it was in 1932 and 1933 the domestic sugar-beet industry justified its immortality in the economic life of this country.

REDUCTION OF DUTY ON CUBAN SUGAR IN 1934

When President Roosevelt decided to reduce the Cuban sugar duty on sugar coming to the United States from Cuba he knew quite well that some type of compensation would have to be offered to the American farmer growing sugar beets. The processing tax was then applied and with it direct benefits began to flow to the American sugar-beet grower in lieu of the reduction in duty allowed to those who own and operate sugarcane plantations in Cuba. This processing tax plan was held unconstitutional. The Cuban duty was reduced by the President from \$2 per 100 pounds down to 90 cents per 100 pounds on raw sugar coming in from Cuba.

SUGAR ACT OF 1937

September 1, 1937, the President approved the present sugar act now in operation and under which a benefit payment is going to the United States beet grower, and this is in lieu of the \$1.10 per 100 pounds on raw sugar which he allowed to the sugar industry of Cuba. The intent of the 1937 act was to preserve the domestic sugar industry—beet and cane.

SECRETARY'S POWER UNDER 1937 ACT

If under the 1937 sugar act the mill operators are obtaining too great a return as compared to the sugar-beet and sugarcane growers, should the Secretary of Agriculture complain about the matter when he holds in his hands such powers as are granted by the 1937 act. Let those who would be informed read the act very carefully. Of course, the industry has enjoyed the general pick-up in operating profits which other branches of American industry have enjoyed when comparing the present situation (1938) with 1932 and 1933. The record shows this improvement in most all lines of industry. It is not fair to restrict the statement to the sugar industry. Neither is it fair to claim that the general improvement in the industry is due to some specific act of Congress.

THE MOMENTARY SITUATION

Now it appears the President desires to further reduce the Cuban duty from 90 cents to 75 cents per 100 pounds raw value of sugar. This proposed reduction has greatly affected present prices and the value of inventories of sugar now in the hands of producers and the trade. The proposal has affected prices adversely. The Secretary of Agriculture places great emphasis on "past" performance. Why does he not discuss prospective prices on present inventories; prospective prices the beet growers—farmers—and sugarcane growers will receive for their product by reason of it having to move into channels of consumption at present and probably much lower prices? Farmers are interested in the future. The past is a closed book. The Secretary has already made releases on prospects for 1939 crops other than sugar. Now let him say to the domestic growers of sugar—cane and beet—what he thinks they will receive if present prices, or if lower prices, prevail on the unsold portion of their 1938 crop and the coming 1939 crop. No doubt the Secretary would prefer to not venture into this field of prophecy. But in presenting my thoughts to the Congress, let me say that I am interested in what the future promises to the growers of sugar in our domestic industry. Again, why does the Secretary deal with the price of sugar to the consumer in one release and then in a later release talk as if the previous release dealt with the price of sugar as paid to the grower by processor and the Government through the benefit payment. The layman has difficulty in comprehending just what the Secretary does say. The sugar expert can, of course, understand all that is said and so can the Secretary and his sugar experts. Therefore, let me admonish you to keep in mind hereafter that either one of two prices may be under discussion; that is, the price paid by the consumer to the retail trade and the price paid to the farmer by the processor and the Government.

DOES THE DOMESTIC SUGAR INDUSTRY FACE ANOTHER DISCOURAGING PERIOD?

What the industry and its friends want to know now is, Will the Government extend a friendly interest in the future? Do we now face an unfriendly period? Is Cuba to be given greater consideration in the future than the domestic industry is to receive? Will the Department of Agriculture point to past performance rather than remove all doubt as to future cooperation? Must the industry suffer heavy losses on present inventories and the 1939 crop? Time will answer these questions, but it might encourage industry—private industry—if they could be answered now.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for a long time we have heard much about "pump priming" and "relief."

These phrases have been used by the New Deal to excuse deficit after deficit and to justify an ever-increasing public debt which has now reached mountainous proportions.

Our national debt by 1940, according to President Roosevelt's own calculations, will reach an all-time high of \$44,-

458,000,000. Others in Government calculate that if all of the appropriations now asked for by the President are granted, the public debt by 1940 will actually exceed the statutory limitation of \$45,000,000,000.

Indeed, it was recently stated in newspapers that the President would ask the Congress to raise the statutory limitation of the public debt.

We have recently been given a new catch phrase under which the New Deal seeks to justify and excuse our enormous national debt and the constantly increasing deficit. This new term is "Government investments."

It is apparent that we are now passing out of the era of "pump priming" and we are entering an era of "Government investments" propaganda.

Now, it seems to me that it is utterly dangerous for us Members of Congress to try to fool ourselves or the country any longer concerning this matter of Federal expenditures. Spending is spending; waste is waste; extravagance is extravagance; political racketeering is political racketeering, regardless of the name by which they may be called.

Someone once said that a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. It is equally true that a polecat called by any other name would smell just as offensive. It does not make the slightest difference to the taxpayers whether their hard-earned dollars are taken from them under the pretense of "pump priming" or under the pretense of "Government investments."

You may change the name or phrase but you do not alter the facts. The Federal debt cannot be reduced, or extravagant spending stopped, by euphonious phrases. The debt will be paid out of the pocketbooks of the American taxpayers and by no other means. These continuing deficits will be curtailed only by efficiency and economy in Government. It is time to face these facts. We can no longer ignore them.

The President has outlined to this Congress plans and requirements for a \$9,000,000,000 Budget. If things continue as they are now going, we may well face in 1940 a \$10,000,000,000 Budget.

I am greatly disturbed by the declaration by our President that a \$9,000,000,000 or a \$10,000,000,000 Budget for this country is a fixed and unchangeable fact and that, of necessity, we must raise the national income to \$80,000,000,000 a year in order that 10 percent of the people's income may be arbitrarily taken from the citizens to sustain the extravagance, the political exploitation and racketeering which has characterized the administration of public affairs for the past 6 years.

There are many of us, Mr. Speaker, who deny that we are confronted with a \$9,000,000,000 or a \$10,000,000,000 annual Budget as a fixed and unchangeable fact in the affairs of our Nation.

The administration now talks about a new kind of trick bookkeeping—two sets of books—one in which to keep certain items of expenditures, and the other in which to keep so-called Government investments.

Now, it is common knowledge that the New Deal administration has been writing off millions of dollars in so-called loans and investments which are not collectible. It is also a fact that the Government is carrying on its books as assets many more millions which are today uncollectible. Any Member of Congress who desires to confirm this fact has but to study the list of commitments of this Government in which the principal and interest on loans have been guaranteed by some department of the Government. These are not assets. They are plain losses.

The President, in his message of January 4, said:

Many people have the idea that as an agent we are overburdened with debt and are spending more than we can afford. That is not so. Despite our Federal Government expenditures the entire debt of our national economic system, public and private together, is no larger than it was in 1929, and the interest thereon is far less than it was in 1929.

That, Mr. Speaker, is an excellent illustration of this new trick bookkeeping which is proposed for the Government.

The private debt in 1929 and in the years preceding was vastly greater than it is now, because there was a vastly greater amount of private business going on. Private capital, at that time, had not been scared into hiding by hostile administration attitudes and punitive taxation. Businessmen were willing to borrow credit and venture into commercial and industrial operations because they believed they had at least a fair chance to get a reasonable profit without Government competition, without labor disorders, and without punitive policies on the part of the administration.

The statement I just quoted from the President's message further illustrates this trick governmental bookkeeping, because it apparently has actually persuaded the President that the financial situation of the Nation is now better than it was in 1929; that we are not spending more than we can afford; and, on the basis of this economic philosophy, we can go on spending far into the indefinite future without worrying for a moment about the size of the Federal debt or of the fiscal state of the Union.

Certainly a tremendous change has taken place in President Roosevelt's financial reasoning since March 10, 1933, when he told Congress:

For 3 long years the Federal Government has been on the road to bankruptcy * * *.
Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policies. We must avoid this danger.

When Mr. Roosevelt made these statements in his message in 1933, the increase in the national debt from March 3, 1929, to March 4, 1933, had been \$3,592,000,000, or an average increase of only \$898,000,000.

And now, by the President's own calculations, we are better off financially as a Government that we were in 1933, although the Federal debt will have grown from \$20,937,000,000 on March 4, 1933, to \$44,458,000,000 on July 1, 1940.

This will be an increase in 7 years under the New Deal of \$23,521,000,000. And this, in turn, represents an average annual increase under the New Deal of \$3,360,000,000, and also represents an average annual increase of 275 percent greater than the average annual increase which in 1933 impelled Mr. Roosevelt to warn the country that "for 3 long years the Federal Government has been on the road to bankruptcy."

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, this trick bookkeeping is not going to reduce the public debt or put the brakes on these recurring deficits. Trick bookkeeping is not going to relieve the taxpayers who have to raise the money for these expenditures, whether they be called regular or extraordinary expenditures, whether they be called "pump priming" or whether they be called "Government investments."

We all favor an \$80,000,000,000 income for this Nation. There is no argument about that. In fact, there is no reason why our national income should not be even greater than that if it is based upon sound economy rather than inflationary economy. We should try to achieve an \$80,000,000,000 national income in order that our people may have work; that they may be self-sustaining and prosperous, and not in order that 10 percent of it may be eaten up by taxation to support an extravagant bureaucracy and political waste and racketeering.

It has been pointed out recently by well-known writers on governmental affairs that there is a great difference in sound economics between investments and expenditures. Certainly the business affairs of the Government ought to be conducted on sound economic lines.

If a man invests his money in food or clothing, which he is going to consume or wear out, he is making expenditures. If he puts his money into a factory in which he intends to manufacture food or clothing which he expects to market at a profit, he is making an investment. The same thing is true of the Government. Federal funds which are spent for made work or for non-self-liquidating projects are expenditures—plain expenditures—and nothing else. They may or may not in some cases be desirable or necessary, but certainly there is no need for us to fool ourselves by entering them on the Government books as investments.

Of course, it is easy if we adopt this catch phrase of "Government investments" to spend money on all sorts of impractical experiments and then claim that it is a "Government investment" in cultural or spiritual values. There is a very grave doubt, however, that many of these so-called investments in cultural and spiritual values have yielded any return in that direction. However, a sound economy and a stable Government credit demands that we look squarely at the nature of our expenditures, instead of fooling ourselves by trick bookkeeping and fancy phrases.

One well-known newspaper columnist, Mark Sullivan, pointed out recently that Talleyrand, noted French diplomatist and statesman, was aware of this device of the artful use of catch phrases. Talleyrand, in his memoirs, according to this columnist, said:

A chief art of politics is to invent new names for things which, under their old names, have become unpopular.

This same writer points out that David Cushman Coyle, in a magazine article which appeared about a year ago, wrote:

The fact is still there but the name was wrong; it is time to adopt the more accurate vocabulary. * * * Once the people understand this distinction they can be shown that the Federal finances are in a sound condition.

That phrase, "once the people understand this distinction they can be shown that Federal finances are in sound condition," is disquieting to me. It has the sinister tone of fooling the people. At this season of the year it might be appropriate to note in passing that Lincoln once said something to the effect that you can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time. The elections last November would seem to have confirmed Mr. Lincoln's declaration in some degree.

It has been pointed out several times by Members of Congress that the present New Deal administration has spent in its short life of 6 years more than 33 percent than was spent in the 128 years from 1789 to 1917. It has also been pointed out that the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year of 1937 showed that the total expenditures of the United States Government from 1789 to June 30, 1917, were only \$28,700,000,000, and by March 3, 1938, they had risen to \$155,000,000,000.

The repeated assertions of the present administration that emergency expenditures account for and justify the tremendous increase in public expenditures is not correct. The Treasurer's report, just referred to, shows that regular operating expenditures of the Government rose from \$2,779,000,000 in 1933 to \$3,189,000,000 in 1937, an increase of \$410,000,000 in 5 years.

This increase in the regular operating expenditures is especially significant when it is considered that during the 10-year period from July 1, 1921, to June 30, 1931, the entire expenditures of the Government, exclusive of debt retirement, increased from \$3,372,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1922 to only \$3,652,000,000 in 1931. Keep in mind that the operating expenditures during this period represented 87 percent of all the costs of Government, exclusive of debt retirement.

In 1934 the first complete fiscal year of the Roosevelt administration, regular operating expenditures were 33.3 percent of the total expenditures. In 1937 regular operating expenditures had risen to 42.8 percent of the total expenditures.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are only some of the plain facts which show the fallacy and danger of adopting any system of trick bookkeeping which will tend to fool the people and ourselves as to Government expenditures. Every thinking citizen in this country knows that we cannot continue spending as we have been spending for the last 6 years.

The Roosevelt administration has been 6 years getting us into the fix we are in. Now, Mr. Roosevelt and his followers call upon the Republicans to tell them how to rescue the Nation, and they want the answer in less than 6 weeks.

There is no single answer to these problems. They are so interrelated in our economy that only a general reformation

of all the wasteful spending, political racketeering, wild experimentation, and theoretical financing can save us.

The President has asked the Republicans where we would curtail expenditures and thereby reduce these annual deficits. I say that one good place to begin is by cutting off political racketeering in relief. Relief must be made efficient and economical. It must be put on a nonpartisan, nonfavoritism basis so that the greatest possible amount of every relief dollar will reach the needy who are entitled to it.

Another way to curtail relief expenditures would be to eliminate from the relief rolls every individual who is not justly entitled to be on relief. Put into their places some of the worthy unemployed citizens who have never received a dollar of relief in the 6 years of the New Deal. Over that period we have had an average of 11,000,000 unemployed, but the Administration's own figures show that the work-relief peak—reached just prior to election last fall—was but 3,200,000.

Reduce the vast army of political henchmen who stalk the corridors of the governmental establishments in Washington and who infest this country in every village and hamlet.

Encourage private investment. Adopt a cooperative attitude toward business instead of punitive tax policies and hostile administration attitudes. Instead of trusting our money to political racketeers to "invest" under the false name of "pump priming," let us encourage private capital, private industry, and private agriculture to seize the pump handle and go to work.

Restore and retain our rich home markets for American producers, American farmers, and American workers.

Trim all along the line in every department and activity in government. Cut off every dollar of useless expenditures that can be curtailed.

Rise above partisanship to the principle of a sound nation, in which we all may be prosperous.

Get away from sectional rivalries and class jealousies and turn as a united people to work our way out of this morass of depression in which we are today.

Follow this program and it would not be long until the sun of prosperity would shine upon us again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take this opportunity to make a few comments on our foreign policy and also to speak briefly on the arms embargo that was adopted by the Congress 2 years ago against both belligerents in Spain.

Members of Congress are being swamped by letters and telegrams from those who would either have us change that policy or by those who want us to retain the neutrality law as applied against both factions in Spain. The situation since then has changed considerably. Before I point out the change in that situation, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that we have identically the same power when it comes to laying an embargo as the Senate of the United States. However, if you read the newspapers and read the speeches of Senator PITTMAN, Senator NYE, Senator LEWIS, and others, you might come to the conclusion that it was purely a matter of senatorial power and prerogative.

Two years ago, by a vote of 411 to 1, this House adopted an embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war against both belligerents in Spain. At the present time we are being swamped with appeals and petitions for and against the arms embargo in Spain. Agitation is broadcast throughout the country either to uphold that embargo or to do away with it. The newspapers this afternoon state that Barcelona, the largest city and port in all Spain, has been captured by the Franco forces. That capture means that the Nationalists, the Franco forces, have control of over three-quarters of Spain, of their natural resources, their territory, and their population. It also has control of the sea, likewise of all the northern seacoast, the southern seacoast, and a part of the eastern seacoast.

That means that the Franco government actually is the de facto government of Spain. So when Members of Congress are asked to take sides by lifting the arms embargo in favor of the Loyalists, the question that we have to decide is, What is the best interest of the United States of America? It is not necessary to show any preference or to take any sides. When we voted an embargo we did it only for one reason, and that was to keep out of war; to keep out of foreign entanglements, to keep out of these mad and bloody conflicts in Europe.

That was the only reason we were called upon to vote for the Spanish neutrality bill; and now when we find that one faction controls three-quarters of Spain, it would be the height of stupidity for the United States at the eleventh hour to lift the embargo and thereby take sides in behalf of the loyalists against the nationalists who apparently are winning a victory. If we did, we would become the undying enemy of the Franco government.

Our interest in this matter, I submit, is an American interest; and it has always been the policy of our country to maintain neutrality between belligerents. Members of the House have repeatedly asked me what the Committee on Foreign Affairs proposes to do in regard to the Spanish embargo. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS], a distinguished Member of the House, unfortunately is sick. The committee will hold its first meeting next Tuesday. From what I can ascertain from members of the committee there is no intention on their part to hold any hearings on the Spanish neutrality bill or to change it in any respect. I think that has been agreed on by both Republican and Democratic members of the committee.

I submit by request a resolution and a letter to the House. The letter I will read, as it is addressed to me:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., January 25, 1939.

HON. HAMILTON FISH,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: A great deal of agitation is at present noticeable regarding the present neutrality law and the attempts being made by the administration to amend the neutrality law so as to remove all restrictions and to give full discretionary powers to our President.

Our society is vigorously opposed to such a policy and specifically opposed to the desire of now permitting the export of arms to the Loyalist forces of Spain. In the opinion of our political committee chairman, this would be tantamount to war.

We know that you feel with us all the way on this neutrality question and I am therefore prevailing upon you to present to the House of Representatives and to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached memoranda and petition.

Thanking you in anticipation of your kindness and cooperation, I beg to remain, with best regards,

Very sincerely yours,

THEO. H. HOFFMANN, Chairman.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., January 25, 1939.

To the Congress of the United States:

We herewith respectfully petition Congress not to amend the neutrality law in surrender to the clamor of those in sympathy with either side in the internal conflict now apparently drawing to a close in Spain.

To now permit the export of arms to the loyalist forces of Spain would be tantamount to our engaging in war.

Respectfully yours,

STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA,
THEO. H. HOFFMANN, Chairman.
F. W. MAYER, Secretary.

The Steuben Society of America is composed of patriotic American citizens and has no connection with Nazi propaganda.

In the remaining minutes I would like to make some comments on the speech made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] yesterday. He asked, What is the foreign policy of the United States? He wanted the President of the United States to be called by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate at a joint conference to explain what the policy of the United States is in respect to our foreign affairs. I think it would be more advisable if the President came before the entire Congress and told the

Congress and the American people exactly what the foreign policy of our country is today. I admit I have not the slightest idea what the foreign policy of this administration is.

I have been doing my best for the last 6 years to find out what the New Deal foreign policy is, but have been unable to do so except in one respect; and that is, that the President of the United States has asked the Congress to give him the power to determine the aggressor nation. If we did we would be surrendering our constitutional war powers, and would be involved in every foreign dispute, conflict, and war throughout the world. This is the only definite recommendation of the President, and I am unalterably opposed to it.

So that I may not be misunderstood on partisan grounds permit me to say that I opposed this demand under Republican administrations. The same request was made by a former Republican Secretary of State, Mr. Henry L. Stimson. It was made before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It did not receive one single Republican vote. It has been repudiated by former President Hoover time after time, particularly in recent years.

Mr. Stimson now announces in the press that he has joined with the President of the United States to ask the Congress to give the President the power to determine the aggressor nation. It is the old League of Nations and collective security platform all over again. It would be the most dangerous power if the Congress gave to any one man the right to determine the aggressor nation, and a direct step to being involved in war. It would mean abandoning and surrendering our constitutional power to declare war. I specifically mention Mr. Stimson. Every American has a right to express his views in this country, but I do not know a single Republican Member of Congress, either in the House or in the Senate, who supports the contention of former Secretary of State Stimson that the Congress should give to the President this power to determine the aggressor nation and thereby permit him to push or drag us into foreign wars.

What is and what has been the policy of the United States on foreign affairs? Our foreign policy was established by George Washington in 1793, when all Europe was at war. The world was then in the throes of one of the eternal wars of Europe that have been going on ever since. He proclaimed a policy of neutrality, nonintervention, and peace. This became the traditional foreign policy of the United States of America. It has been upheld by every President and Secretary of State since that time, by Thomas Jefferson, by Madison, Monroe, and Jackson—by all our great Presidents and Secretaries of State. These principles were accepted as the fundamental foreign policy of our country—neutrality, nonintervention, and peace.

Yet now the President of the United States seeks to secure from the Congress the right to determine the aggressor nation, an utterly unneutral act. Every international lawyer would tell you that it is not only unneutral and unfriendly but that it would be a cause of war if we were to determine that some first-class power was the aggressor nation and then lay sanctions and embargoes and join in any collective security action against that nation. It would be all right to apply such a policy against Haiti or Liberia, or some small nation that has no navy; but to apply it against a first-class power, against Germany, or Japan, or Italy, or England, or France would lead immediately to war.

The President in his speech said that we have a rendezvous with destiny. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if we ever surrender our constitutional right to declare war and give the President power to determine the aggressor nation—whether he be a Republican or Democratic President makes no difference—we would have not only a rendezvous with destiny, but we would have a rendezvous with death, bankruptcy, disaster, and loss of our free institutions.

I reiterate to the Members that the identical power of laying embargoes rests as well in the House of Representatives as in the Senate.

I repeat for the benefit of the new Members that our Committee on Foreign Affairs does not propose to take any ac-

tion—at least in the near future—toward changing the neutrality laws of our country.

The main neutrality law, or that part of it known as the "cash-and-carry feature," expires on May 1 of this year. Before that time the committee will hold hearings to determine if it is necessary to do away with the "cash and carry" section entirely, and I do not believe it would be a mistake if we did, because it gives certain discretionary powers to the President, and I for one am against giving any discretionary powers to the President to involve us in any war at any time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, we in this country face a very serious situation. We are in the midst of a war hysteria, a fear and dread of war, and of dangerous war propaganda, and if the women of America believed one-half of what they read in the newspapers and one-half of what they heard over the radio, they would look under their beds every night to see if there was not a Jap, a German, or an Italian there ready to pounce out on poor, little, defenseless America and gobble up both North and South America.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The potential enemies of the Republic, according to the best information I can get, are Japan, Germany, and Italy. Japan has her hands full in China, Italy in Abyssinia, and Germany in central Europe. Will the gentleman explain how all of these charges at the present time can only exist in disturbed mentalities?

Mr. FISH. I agree with the gentleman that the President is largely responsible for this war propaganda. He leads the American people to believe that we are about to be attacked, that we are about to be invaded, that our cities are about to be bombed. I challenge the President of the United States to specify what nation or nations has the faintest thought or capacity to invade the United States of America. [Applause.] All the totalitarian states are exceedingly busy in their own backyards.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does not the gentleman realize that the Monroe Doctrine is in danger in Latin America, and does not the gentleman believe that Latin America can be and is being invaded by totalitarian propaganda at the present time as a prelude to an armed invasion?

Mr. FISH. I happen to be a firm believer in the Monroe Doctrine. I believe in upholding the Monroe Doctrine and serving notice on every nation that if they attempt to invade any part of Latin America it means war with the United States immediately. [Applause.] But what are the facts? The facts are that we have the greatest Navy today that we ever had in the history of the United States, a navy three times as large as Germany's, twice as large as Italy's, and 50 percent larger than Japan's. With appropriations already authorized, it will be just so much larger than the navies of those nations. We can defend every inch and foot of our own territory and of our possessions. We can uphold and defend the Monroe Doctrine. But in spite of all that the war propaganda has become so misleading that the people in the Middle West believe their cities are about to be bombed.

Let me answer that with facts and figures, not propaganda. Let us assume we sunk our entire Navy and that we went to war with these three so-called totalitarian states. How many airplanes do you think they can bring over here to bombard us? Altogether they have eight airplane carriers. Italy has none; Germany has two, one built and one building; Japan has six; making a total of eight airplane

carriers. Those airplane carriers can carry a maximum of 50 airplanes, or between 40 and 50. Assuming a maximum of 50, these eight airplane carriers could carry 400 airplanes. We have today in the United States approximately 4,000 planes. Congress has already authorized 5,300 planes. We have 4,000 of the best planes in the world today and the best pilots. If we sunk our Navy, and if those three dictatorial nations combined, all they could bring over would be 400 planes. We have 4,000, and if those 4,000 planes of ours could not handle 400 enemy planes, we had better do something about it immediately.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. In view of what the gentleman has said, can it not be said that the President is using this hysteria as a springboard for a third-term campaign?

Mr. FISH. I would rather let some other Member of the House answer that question. I wish I had more confidence in the President, because I believe this war hysteria and demand for huge armaments are the direct result of the provocative and inflammatory speeches of the President when he says we are on the verge of war and must join in collective action to police and quarantine the world.

These intemperate and alarming speeches of President Roosevelt are copied by our State Department and our Cabinet officers vying with each other in hurling insult after insult against foreign governments. I believe we are confronted with a dangerous situation so long as the President continues to insult these foreign nations and at the same time inflame our people back home.

Mr. KNUTSON. May I say to the gentleman, he has as much confidence in the President as I have.

Mr. FISH. If the gentleman wants to know how much confidence I have in the President, I will tell him. On one side of the Hudson River up where I live, I have Father Divine and his angels. On the other side of the Hudson River I have the great White Father and his "brain trusters." I confess to the gentleman as between the two I have more faith in Father Divine and his angels. [Applause.]

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. As a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, I am interested in one statement made by the gentleman. Will the gentleman give his authority for the statement we now have 4,000 of the best planes in the world?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I can do it both directly and indirectly. May I say to the gentleman before I answer the question that, if we have not, I would like to scrap them all tomorrow and have the best; but I do not believe we need 8,500, which we are about to be asked to authorize. Both the Army and the Navy Air Corps claim that they have the best planes. If we have not, it is our own fault, because France only yesterday placed an order for 600 American pursuit planes, due to the fact they are the best in the world, because they are the fastest and strongest. There is every reason to believe that the 4,000 planes of ours are the best, the fastest, and the most effective. If we have not got them—and I believe we have—then this House ought to see to it that we scrap those that are not the best and provide only for the best and fastest planes.

But I see no reason to have 8,500 planes. I will, however, speak on that issue later on when the legislation comes before the House.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. For a brief question.

Mr. GEYER of California. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that he has more faith in Father Divine than he has in the President?

Mr. FISH. On these particular matters, the gentleman certainly did, and more specifically in regard to his inflammatory speeches that have caused war hysteria in America. In my opinion President Roosevelt is both an internationalist and interventionist.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman believe his constituent, the President of the United States, ought to be in position to know something about potential wars? The international bankers, munition makers, and war profiteers are disseminating war propaganda all over America, and since the international banking house of Roosevelt has joined the munitions house of du Pont in the holy bonds of matrimony, they might explain some of the propaganda.

Mr. FISH. I believe this House has made up its mind on one thing, and that is, it proposes to keep this country out of all foreign wars. [Applause.] If the President or anyone else tries to get us into a foreign war it is our duty to see to it that he does not succeed. I believe we can keep out if the Congress insists on keeping out. The only way we will get into a foreign war is by letting this war hysteria spread to such an extent that it gets out of bounds.

Where does it come from? It comes from our enemies within. It comes from Communists, who would like to see us go to war with Germany and with Japan for the benefit of Soviet Russia. It comes from the British, who would like us to preserve the British Empire. It comes from internationalists and those who believe in collective security, and the League of Nations. It comes from the interventionists, who would have us scrap our policy of neutrality and adopt one of collective security, sanctions, and war commitments.

As far as I am concerned, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I propose to do everything I can by my voice and vote on that committee to keep the United States out of all foreign wars. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order heretofore made, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I should just like to comment on some of the things that were said about the President a few minutes ago by observing that in the campaign just closed he was accused of being a dictator. I hope you understand what I have in mind.

This afternoon a speech was made on this floor having to do with the nomination by the President of Mr. Thomas R. Amlie, of Wisconsin, for a position on the Interstate Commerce Commission. I wish to address myself for a few minutes to that speech, not only as regards Mr. Amlie personally but because of certain fundamental implications in that speech and in other things which I find going on about the country and in the House which it seems to me bode no good for a real continued expression of the democracy America has known.

The man about whom that speech was made happens to be a veteran of the World War and has been commander of two American Legion posts. I happen to know he is as fundamentally devoted to constitutional democracy in this country as any man in this House. [Applause.]

The point I want to make is that I believe there are two groups of people whose work today is the most dangerous work there is to democracy in America. I refer on the one hand, to those people on the left who refer to everybody that does not agree with them as Fascists, and, on the other hand, to those people on the right who refer to everybody that does not agree with them as Communists. I should like to point out with all the vigor at my command that if that sort of tactics is pursued long enough a spirit will be built up in this country whereby you will have two groups of people so much opposed that there will be no possibility of sympathetic and understanding contact between them. [Applause.]

Let us think for a minute what real disloyalty constitutes. If a man says to me or anyone else, "I do not like the United States; I believe some other country is better than the United States; I think the fundamental Constitution of the United States ought to be overthrown," I think that is disloyalty. If a man says to American citizens, "You owe allegiance else-

where than to the Government of this constitutional democracy," then I think that is disloyalty. However, I do not think it is disloyalty if a man makes a speech or does anything else in advocacy of economic measures with which I fundamentally and absolutely disagree, providing that man believes in his heart those economic measures are the best means he can see for the preservation of the fundamental liberties of the people of this country.

After all, democracy means something pretty earthy, pretty fundamental, pretty much at the roots of life. It means the opportunity for the common citizen to enjoy freedom, to enjoy personal, religious, and civil liberties. Yes; it means more than that. It means the maintenance with all the strength at our command of the greatest possible degree of equality of economic opportunity in the Nation, because it is out of the soil of equality of economic opportunity that a democracy grows and flourishes.

I myself desire the greatest possible amount of freedom for all people; and if, for example, I should be compelled to choose between freedom for speculators in farm commodities to do exactly as they please and the freedom of the farmers in America to continue to conduct an independent farming business, I should choose freedom for the farmers of America, even if I had to interfere with the license of the speculators. If in order to insure the freedom of the small-business men of America I had to interfere with the license of monopoly, I would choose to interfere with the license of monopoly rather than to sacrifice the small man to it.

I believe it is most unfortunate for anyone to take the attitude that because a man disagrees with you or with me on an economic question he therefore is considered not a good American. There are a lot of people who have hoped we could come to the place where we would have a full production of wealth and a full consumption of wealth in this country. [Applause.]

I am one of those people. I believe, as a matter of fact, that the achievement of that goal is, perhaps, the most important single thing we have before us, and I have a fundamental respect for every single individual who has a program whereby he believes that this can be accomplished, regardless of whether it is the same idea I have or not. Just because a man advocates that certainly ought not to condemn him.

I happen to have a little pamphlet here having to do with the industrial expansion bill which represents an attempt to try to work out a method whereby industry could be assisted to an increase of production through Government guidance and guarantees against loss through unsalable surpluses, in somewhat the same way as we have brought about a control of production in agriculture. It happens there are certain remarks by Mr. Amlie contained in this pamphlet, some of which I want to read. He says:

But it has always seemed to me that there was little justification for any hope in such a program in the United States. I have written extensively on the subject, and have as a result been condemned at considerable length in the official publication of the Communist Party in this country. I have long been convinced that the American people will never regain that equality or opportunity that has been an American heritage by the traditional program of either the Socialists or the Communists. On the other hand, I am equally sure that the old order of laissez faire and rugged individualism will never again work satisfactorily. I am convinced that the American people will regain the equality of opportunity of which they dream only when American industry is operating at full capacity.

Now, suppose a man believes sincerely and in his heart that danger to our democracy is real. Suppose he loves liberty and democracy and the rights of the common people and the preservation of constitutional liberties in this country with all his heart, and suppose he believes that certain economic measures, which may change certain monopolistic practices in this country, are essential to preserve those things, do you blame him for advocating the things in which he believes? I do not think you should. I do not ask you to agree with him, I do not ask you to be glad because he got an appointment, but I do ask that fair play be used, and I do ask that

the real facts be given and not that irresponsible charges be allowed to take their place.

Mr. Amlie has been referred to here today as a small-town, country lawyer. If I recall correctly, Abraham Lincoln was a small-town, country lawyer. I believe Henry Clay was one. I think Andrew Jackson was one. I think I could name a lot of others of the very greatest people in all the history of our country who have been such small-town, country lawyers, and I believe we could ill afford to do without them.

In conclusion I simply want to make this very plain. What I am appealing for is this: We in the United States are undoubtedly confronted with most serious problems. The great problem is the problem of unemployment, and that problem is the result of a lack of full production, and that problem, in turn, is largely the consequence of a failure on the part of our distributive system to distribute consuming power among the people in accordance with our capacity to produce. Here, some advocate retirement pensions; some, monetary reform; some, public works; some, changes in the tax laws, and so on. The important thing is that these problems are common to us all. Let us meet here in this great parliamentary body, let us meet on the platforms of this country, and let us put our hearts and minds on the task of solving that problem, and let us be certain that we will make a real, valid distinction between what does constitute disloyalty to America, on the one hand, and what merely constitutes disagreement with our own particular economic views, on the other, and let us be sure we maintain that fundamental faith and confidence in one another, without which, indeed, democracy may be in danger. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if some one wants me to yield to him I shall be pleased to take the time, otherwise I have finished my remarks.

Mr. KELLER. I want to ask the gentleman a question. I would like to ask what the Members of this body think of a new man who comes in here succeeding Tom Amlie, known to many of us intimately, and makes the sort of speech that that the gentleman who succeeded him made here today. I put it up to every man to stop and think a little about it and wonder what we are going to do with the idea of free speech in this country and free democracy in this country if we tolerate and endorse such speeches as that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am sure the gentleman understands I am not endorsing the speech. I would like to say that I was glad to note in the speech that was made this afternoon by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES] that he himself remarked that the question of personal integrity and ability on the part of Mr. Amlie was not at stake, and I am sure that everybody who knows anything about him will agree with that statement.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Yes.

Mr. PACE. If we do not tolerate speeches like that, what would become of free speech in this country?

Mr. KELLER. I agree with that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I said in answer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] that I did not endorse it, I did not use the word "tolerate." I tried to make it plain in my remarks that I believed that people, whether they agree with me or with the gentleman or with anyone, have a right to express their views.

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. KITCHENS. As I understand the gentleman from California, he stands for the right of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] to follow the inspiration he obtains from Father Divine and his angels, rather than from the President of the United States, if he so desires.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. If the gentleman from New York is so inclined, I think he has that right.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes. I yield to my fine, distinguished colleague from Colorado.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I remind the gentleman and other Members that when President Woodrow Wilson nominated Mr. Justice Brandeis to the Supreme Court he was denounced as an anarchist by the very same reactionary groups and interests that are denouncing Mr. Amlie as a Communist, but long since, whenever these groups and interests want to show to the country that the Supreme Court is still worthy of their confidence and respect, they always put Mr. Justice Brandeis in as exhibit A.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. So that inasmuch as Mr. Amlie is a young man there is still hope for him; he, too, may be respectable 20 years from now.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman; and may I add here a further word. Objection was made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES] to a constitutional amendment submitted some years ago by Mr. Amlie. Now, when a man proposes a constitutional amendment here is what he is really saying. He is saying, "Here is a proposition. If Congress passes it by a two-thirds vote, if the President signs it, and if three-quarters of the States ratify it, then, and not till then, I propose that it be the law of the land." That is democracy. It is the American way of making changes when an unquestioned majority of the people working through our constitutional machinery will that such changes be made.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; gladly to my friend from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. If I understand correctly, Mr. Amlie is not a Democrat in his politics.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is correct.

Mr. PATRICK. What is he?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. He is a Progressive.

Mr. PATRICK. There cannot be another Democrat appointed on that Commission as it now stands?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is correct.

Mr. PATRICK. And the President refuses to appoint a Republican, or at least he did not appoint one.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Of course, I do not know the President's mind, but as a matter of fact he did not in this case.

Mr. PATRICK. I thought that might be interesting.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. As a matter of fact, does not the gentleman recognize or understand that the leading economists of the United States look upon Mr. Thomas R. Amlie as one of the best thinkers along the lines of political economy that we have in America today?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I believe that to be true, both by people who agree with him and by people who do not agree with him.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It is recognized by everyone that when Mr. Amlie was a Member of this House he served with honor and distinction. As he has established himself qualified to serve in this House, then he certainly is qualified to serve in any branch of the Government.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from California believe if he were the President of the

United States, or in the President's place, and were to get exactly the same words from the Republican side of the House that he heard today, that he would be interested in appointing a Republican to this place which has been vacated by a Republican?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman. I think I would be amused by some of those remarks. I do not think I would lose by sense of humor, and I know the President will not lose his.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does concede that the Republicans are entitled to pay their share of the taxes to support these offices?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Oh, I say to the gentleman that throughout my whole speech I have tried very hard to make it plain that I have a wholesome respect for other points of view on all of these questions, whether they agree with mine or not. I do not think I know what the purport of the gentleman's question is.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just wondered whether we would still be recognized and have the right to live in this country or express an opinion, or whether we were just to contribute, and I ask the gentleman if he thinks the Republicans do have some good points.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman does not think, surely, that members of his party have lacked opportunity to fully express their opinions. And in answer to the second part of his question I will say I am sure the Republicans have many good points.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the appointment of former Congressman Thomas Amlie to the Interstate Commerce Commission should be confirmed by the Senate of the United States. The Interstate Commerce Act provides that—

Not more than six Commissioners shall be appointed from the same political party.

Mr. Speaker, the present make-up of the Interstate Commerce Commission is as follows:

Chairman Marion M. Caskie, of Alabama, Democrat; Balthazar H. Meyer, Wisconsin, Republican; Clyde B. Aitchison, Oregon, Republican; Joseph B. Eastman, of Massachusetts, Democrat; Frank McManamy, District of Columbia, Democrat; Claude R. Porter, Iowa, Democrat; William E. Lee, Idaho, Republican; Charles D. Mahaffie, District of Columbia, Democrat; Carroll Miller, Pennsylvania, Democrat; Walter M. Splawn, Texas, Democrat; John L. Rogers, Tennessee, Republican. This Commission is a quasi judicial body, and the section of the law requiring that it be bipartisan was written into the statute to prevent it from becoming a political football of the administrative branch of our Government.

The New Deal leader in the House claimed that Commissioner Eastman is an Independent. Why, he is an old-line Boston Democrat, who was first appointed to the Commission by our Democratic President Woodrow Wilson on December 19, 1918, and confirmed by the Senate on January 24, 1919. He was reappointed by our Republican President Herbert Hoover on December 17, 1929. If you doubt his party affiliations, which were considered when that reappointment was made, I suggest you refer to the New York Times of Wednesday, December 18, 1929, and other great metropolitan newspapers, and you will find that President Hoover reappointed Mr. Eastman as a Democrat.

So right at this very hour, without the appointment of Mr. Amlie, the law has been violated. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been packed, and now it is intended to pack it some more and have eight members from the same political army on the commission.

Beginning with the 1932 election campaign, and through the 1936 and 1938 election campaigns, in and out of Congress, former Congressman Amlie supported actively and openly our New Deal President of the United States. [Applause.]

Should he be confirmed, the letter as well as the spirit of law, which prohibits more than six members of one political party from being members of the quasi judicial Interstate Commerce Commission, will be violated.

In Wisconsin the New Deal political forces have two divisions. We have one division commanded by a Democratic New Deal general and the other commanded by a Progressive New Deal general. The progressive division of the New Deal army, of course, the division in which Mr. Amlie serves, has more members, because it has a company of the Communist brethren and a regiment of Karl Marx Socialist disciples. They are all in the New Deal political army and fly the New Deal political flag. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, I say with all sincerity that there are some other important matters which the Senate of the United States should consider before it confirms the appointment of Mr. Amlie. We have a Federal statute which is called the Logan Act.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Certainly; I yield to the gentleman while I am looking for my copy of the Logan Act.

Mr. PATRICK. I should like to ask you boys if you would make up your minds whether Amlie is a Democrat or whether he is an un-American alien with communistic tendencies.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The Democratic Party of Jefferson and Jackson is a thing of the past. You forget all about the principles of the Democratic Party of Jefferson and Jackson until you shake down the Government employees with \$100 Jackson Day dinners and force the economic royalists to purchase \$250 autographed books in order to raise huge campaign funds. Democrats, Communists, Progressives, and Karl Marx Socialists are united in the New Deal political army to advance and put into effect the principles of Karl Marx and the Communist International. I think that will answer the gentleman. [Applause and laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further unless I can get some more time.

Mr. PATRICK. Some of these gentlemen who were appointed were good Democrats when appointed, were they not?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. No doubt they were. However, the New Deal Soviet Frankenstein monster has swallowed the Democratic Party, the Progressive Party, the Communist Party, and the Socialist Party. It may be interesting for the gentleman to know that William D. Carroll, of Wisconsin, the chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee, called his Wisconsin Democratic leaders together the other day and they unanimously passed a resolution denouncing the appointment of Mr. Amlie.

Mr. PATRICK. How many of the present commissioners does the gentleman regard as good Democrats?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. There are now seven members of the Commission who were Democrats when they were appointed. I will name them if the gentleman does not know them. You must not forget, however, that the Democratic forces have united with the progressive, Communist, and Socialist forces, and are in the New Deal army with them now.

Mr. PATRICK. Then appointing one even whom the gentleman calls Democratic would not be packing the Commission.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Oh, yes; because the law says you can only have six from the same political party. The New Deal now has control of the Federal Government, and

should Mr. Amlie be confirmed the New Deal forces will have eight members on the commission.

Mr. PATRICK. But at least you release him from being a Communist, do you not?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Oh, no. I am going to put the Communist nightshirt on him right now. [Applause.] The "production for use and not for profit" program is not the original doctrine of our progressive New Dealers. It was stolen almost verbatim from this 72-page Communist program entitled "Why Communism?"

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter dated March 3, 1938, from a former distinguished Member of this House, with whom I have served, Hon. R. Walton Moore, who is now the very able Counselor of the State Department. Let us see what he says:

In response to your inquiry of March 1, 1938, whether an individual American citizen is prevented by law from communicating directly with representatives of foreign governments and foreign parliaments, you are informed that the so-called Logan Act, which is found in United States Code, title 18, section 5, provides that every citizen of the United States, whether actually resident or abiding within the same, or in any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or in any foreign country, who, without the permission or authority of the Government, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any verbal or written correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with an intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the Government of the United States, as well as any person who counsels or assists in such correspondence with such intent, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 and imprisoned not more than 3 years.

Notwithstanding the fact that we passed the neutrality law approved August 31, 1935, a measure to preserve the neutrality of America, and later enacted the Spanish Arms Embargo Act, approved January 8, 1937, to preserve the neutrality of America, Thomas R. Amlie, in violation of the Logan Act, communicated directly with the "red" Communist Government of Spain, the puppet government of the Moscow Soviet Communist gang of thieves and murderers. His communication extended greetings and best wishes, and it certainly cannot be construed as helpful in carrying out the neutrality measures of the United States. I respectfully suggest that instead of presenting Mr. Amlie's name to the Senate for confirmation as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the administration would be rendering better service to the country if the Department of Justice would call the attention of the grand jury to Mr. Amlie's communication to the Spanish Government and ask that it be considered under the provisions of the Logan Act.

There must have been great rejoicing in "red" Communist Spain and Moscow when they received news of Mr. Amlie's appointment to the highly important Interstate Commerce Commission. Our New Deal leaders seem to be very interested in the welfare of the Communist brethren in Spain and Moscow. Why, our New Deal leader, the President of the United States, even sent a cable to Mikhail Kalinin, President of Russia, on November 7, 1938, the twenty-first birthday of Soviet Russia. Our President said:

Upon this national anniversary please accept my felicitations and sincere good wishes for the well-being of the people of your country.

Mr. Speaker, the confirmation of Mr. Amlie as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission will certainly not give encouragement to those who love our American constitutional democracy and are opposed to Soviet Communist autocracy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I realize that the Members of the House cannot vote on Mr. Amlie's confirmation. However, since his appointment has been discussed on the floor of the House today, I asked for this time to voice my disapproval of his appointment. In my campaign I promised that

I would not directly or indirectly give any aid or comfort to the bloody red Communist butchers in Moscow, or their puppets in Spain and America, who have been flooding our country with propaganda in favor of repealing our Spanish arms embargo. I know that these Communist forces will rejoice should Mr. Amlie be confirmed. The "red" Communist government in Moscow and its puppet Communist government in Spain have just about repealed the Ten Commandments of the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, confiscated private and church property, destroyed the liberties of free men and women, and slaughtered millions, including the clergy and sisters of mercy, in order to shackle their people in bonds of regimented political and economic slavery. These Communist autocracies have effaced in blood every trace of justice, liberty, morality, and individual human and private property rights.

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish], our ranking Republican member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, indicated that we would not swallow the propaganda and join in policing the world in the name of "saving world democracy" the way we swallowed the propaganda about "making the world safe for democracy" under the World War administration of the Democratic Party and the international bankers and munitions makers who controlled it then as they control it now. [Applause.]

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, if there is nothing further to come before the House, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, January 30, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Friday, January 27, 1939. Business to be considered: Continuation of hearing on H. R. 2531—transportation bill. Commissioner Splawn, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, is to be the witness.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs in room 1310, New House Office Building, at 10:30 a. m. Friday, January 27, for the continued consideration of the President's message on national defense.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on Friday, January 27, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., for the purpose of continuing the consideration of H. R. 2880, "To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," carrying out partially the recommendations of the Hepburn report.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation at 10:30 a. m. Friday, January 27, 1939.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in the committee rooms, Capitol Building, at 10 a. m. Tuesday, January 31, 1939.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Public hearings will begin Wednesday morning, February 1, 1939, at 10 a. m., on social-security legislation, in the Ways and Means Committee room in the New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

335. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to provide for conveying to the United States the land, buildings, and im-

provements comprising the Choctaw and Chickasaw Sanatorium and General Hospital; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

336. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to provide and maintain an adequate supply of suitable seed for production of food for the population of Hawaii in time of emergency; to the Committee on Agriculture.

337. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to fix the salaries of Assistant Postmasters General; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

338. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year 1939, amounting to \$1,500,000 (H. Doc. No. 134); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

339. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting three supplemental estimates of appropriation, totaling \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to remain available until June 30, 1940, for the War Department (H. Doc. No. 135); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

340. A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report of its activities and expenditures for the month of December 1938 (H. Doc. No. 136); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

341. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 28, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., with view to ascertaining exact damages caused by seepage and backwater at Cochrane, Wis., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted February 23, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 137); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

342. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 17, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Metlakatla Harbor, Alaska, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted February 8, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 138); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

343. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 11, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Rochester (Charlotte) Harbor, Genesee River, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 139); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1851) granting World War veterans' compensation to John Paszczuk; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 3207) granting a pension to Mrs. Carl Rainey; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3311. A bill providing that 100 percent of the annual gross receipts, including money-order fees, be credited for the

annual classification of post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 3312. A bill to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State due process of law and equal protection of the laws, and to prevent the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3313. A bill to impose a duty on binding twine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHULTE:

H. R. 3314. A bill to provide shorter hours of duty for members of the fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3315. A bill to provide a permanent program to maintain the cotton-producing industry on a sound basis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3316. A bill to authorize equitable compensation for circuit court and district court judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 3317. A bill to amend chapter XXII of the act of July 9, 1918 (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 10, sec. 1091), providing for the appointment of two Negro cadets to the United States Military Academy in each year by the President; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3318. A bill to amend an act for making further and more effectual provisions for the national defense, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 3319. A bill providing for per capita payments to the Seminole Indians in Oklahoma from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FADDIS:

H. R. 3320. A bill to provide for the common defense by acquiring stocks of strategic and critical materials essential to the needs of industry for the manufacture of supplies for armed forces and the civilian population in time of national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARTER of Ohio:

H. R. 3321. A bill to provide allowances for inactive-status training and for uniforms and equipment for certain officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 3322 (by request). A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 3323. A bill to reduce the \$10,000 limit on payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to \$1,500; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 3324. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Illinois River and its tributary (Ten Mile Creek) in the State of Illinois for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 3325. A bill to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 3326. A bill prohibiting the importation of the United States flag or emblem from foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER:

H. R. 3327. A bill to provide for 20-year maturity and a 5-year moratorium on principal on loans hereafter made by

the Disaster Loan Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 3328. A bill to amend section 32 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and/or completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARTER of Ohio:

H. R. 3329. A bill to amend the National Defense Act of June 30, 1916, as amended, with respect to the pay and allowance of certain Reserve officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI:

H. R. 3330. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. R. 3331. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHANLEY:

H. R. 3332. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the town of Guilford (Guilford Tercentenary); to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

H. R. 3333. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the town of Milford (Milford Tercentenary); to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

H. R. 3334. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the town of Branford (Branford Tercentenary); to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland:

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution authorizing the restoration and preservation of the frigate *Constellation*, and making Baltimore, Md., her home port; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the founding and in aid of the historical restoration of St. Augustine, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN:

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1939, General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution designating August 19 of each year as Aviation Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERRITT:

H. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution to authorize the appropriation of an additional sum of \$1,346,000 for Federal participation in the New York World's Fair 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHANLEY:

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri:

H. Res. 73. Resolution to create a special committee of the House to investigate labor disputes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Resolution No. 1 with reference to sale of munitions and war materials to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD:

H. R. 3335. A bill granting a pension to Raymond P. Satterfield; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 3336. A bill for the relief of William J. Fisher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 3337 (by request). A bill for the relief of the estate of Arthur Weltner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3338. A bill for the relief of J. S. Taylor & Son; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H. R. 3339. A bill granting a pension to Charles F. Boroff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3340. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ella Sebring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3341. A bill granting an increase of pension to Harriet Brownrigg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 3342. A bill granting a pension to Lindsay Powers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD:

H. R. 3343. A bill granting a pension to Susan McKay Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 3344. A bill to authorize the presentation of a Distinguished Service Cross to Harry L. Kast; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 3345. A bill for the relief of the Ninety Six Oil Mill, of Ninety Six, S. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 3346. A bill for the relief of Jesse A. Lott; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 3347. A bill for the relief of Jesse A. Lott; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3348. A bill for the relief of Lewis T. Case; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN:

H. R. 3349. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to present, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to Thomas E. Langdon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3350. A bill for the relief of Oscar R. Wolf; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3351. A bill for the relief of Jean N. Burton and Laura Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3352. A bill granting an annuity to George J. Kleffner; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MERRITT:

H. R. 3353. A bill for the relief of Charlotte M. Green; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3354. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ella Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3355. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth R. Fritts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 3356. A bill to supplement the act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, consider, and render judgment on certain claims of George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd against the United States," approved June 13, 1934; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 3357. A bill granting a pension to Goly Weese; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. R. 3358. A bill for the relief of the widow and minor children of James A. Henderson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3359. A bill for the relief of Lt. Stanley A. Jones, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VREELAND:

H. R. 3360 (by request). A bill for the relief of Thomas A. McGurk; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3361. A bill granting a pension to Della Means; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 3362. A bill granting a pension to Anna M. Fay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 3363. A bill for the relief of the American Insurance Co. of New Jersey; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

571. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Petition of G. B. Hollenbeck, Anna Blohm, and 22 other residents and property owners in territory adjacent to and including the watershed leading into the source or head of the Elkhorn Slough, in the county of Monterey, State of California, urging an appropriation for reclamation and drainage of said project and the construction of a levee across said slough; to the Committee on Appropriations.

572. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of certain citizens of The Dalles, Oreg., requesting that this country shall adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

573. Also, petition of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., protesting against the lifting of the so-called Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

574. By Mr. CRAWFORD: Petition of Henry J. Rock and 85 city firemen of Saginaw, Mich., requesting that the taxes imposed by the Revenue Act of 1936 shall not be retroactive against firemen employed by States, counties, or municipalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

575. Also, petition of Rev. J. B. Surprenant and approximately 200 residents of Saginaw, Mich., urging the maintenance of the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

576. Also, petition of Julia Ellsworth and other residents of Wheeler, Mich., requesting that advertising of alcoholic beverages through press, radio, or other agencies be prohibited; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

577. By Mr. EATON of New Jersey: Petition of 79 citizens of New Jersey, urging support of legislation to exempt small pleasure boats from the provisions of Draft Convention No. 53 of the International Labor Conference Treaty of 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

578. Also, resolution of the New Jersey State Grange, requesting repeal of the Federal tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

579. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition submitted by Rev. Martin J. Watley, of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring general policy of neu-

trality as enunciated in the acts of August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

580. By Mr. JOHNS: Petition of Dan Burns and 97 other residents of Green Bay, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle contained in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

581. Also, petition of William Kane and 20 other citizens of Greenleaf and De Pere, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle contained in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

582. Also, petition of Rev. H. Vande Castle and 82 other residents of Greenleaf, Brillion, and Forest Junction, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

583. Also, petition of Ray Benzschawel and 101 other residents of Newton, Valders, and Cleveland, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

584. Also, petition of Stanley Witczak and 41 other residents of Manitowoc, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle contained in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

585. Also, petition of Rev. A. W. Van Dyke and 76 other citizens of Kaukauna and Appleton, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

586. Also, petition of Rev. Michael S. Wasniewski and 82 other citizens of Pine Grove, Green Bay, and Denmark, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

587. By Mr. JONES of Ohio: Petition of citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio; asking that the present neutrality laws be upheld and that we keep the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

588. By Mr. KEAN: Resolution signed by Joseph B. Shugrue, vice president of the Federation of Holy Name Societies of the Archdiocese of Newark, representing 65,000 Catholic men, urging retention of the embargo on the shipment of arms to Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

589. Also, resolutions signed by Frank Horwath, president, and Emil Schaefer, secretary, of St. Benedict's-Joseph's Sick Benevolent Society of Newark, urging retention of the embargo on the shipment of arms to Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

590. By Mr. KINZER: Petition of citizens of Marietta, Pa., setting forth a declaration of policy on the subject of neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

591. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Mohawk Valley Towns Association of New York State, reaffirming its previous actions which opposed the adoption of a treaty with Canada enabling the use of Government funds to construct the so-called St. Lawrence seaway from the Great Lakes to the ocean, and/or the development of Government water-power projects on the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

592. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of James J. McBride and 24 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the neutrality acts passed by the Congress on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

593. Also, petition of Martin McGrail and 20 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the neutrality acts passed by the Congress on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

594. Also, petition of Charles L. Bunch and 11 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the neutrality acts passed by the Congress on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

595. Also, petition of John W. Johnston and 11 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the neutrality acts passed by the Congress on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

596. Also, petition of Joseph Collins and 41 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the neutrality acts passed by the Congress on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

597. Also, petition of Katherine G. McBride and 20 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging adherence by the United States to our present neutrality laws; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

598. Also, petition of Hugh Coyle and 21 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the neutrality acts passed by the Congress on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

599. Also, petition of Virginia McTigue and 25 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the neutrality acts passed by the Congress on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

600. Also, petition of Mrs. F. Sawyer and 23 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the neutrality acts passed by the Congress on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

601. Also, petition of Margaret Small and 20 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the neutrality acts passed by the Congress on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

602. By Mr. POLK: Petition of Mrs. C. M. Bookman, president of the Ohio League of Women Voters, urging modification of the neutrality acts to insure greater preservation of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

603. Also, petition of A. J. Kirsaddon with 46 other members of Ripley Council, No. 2374, Knights of Columbus, and other citizens of Ripley, Brown County, Ohio, urging the Congress to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as set forth in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended May 1, 1937, and particularly keep the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

604. By Mr. RISK: Petition of Woonsocket (R. I.) Council, No. 113, Knights of Columbus, opposing the lifting of the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

605. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Letter from Martin H. Carmody, supreme knight, Knights of Columbus, New Haven, Conn., containing resolution unanimously adopted by the supreme board of directors, Knights of Columbus,

January 14-15, 1939, urging that the Government of the United States adhere strictly to its present policy of absolute neutrality with respect to the war in Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

606. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Hellenic-American Loyal Club, Inc., of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to un-American activities in the United States of America; to the Committee on Rules.

607. Also, petition of Yankee Division Veterans Association, of Boston, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Public, No. 304, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, proposing an amendment; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

608. Also, petition of Aurelia Torres, Banco de Ponce, Ponce, R. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

609. Also, petition of Josephine W. Johnson, St. Louis, Mo., petitioning consideration of a resolution with reference to the extension through the Farm Security Administration of its rehabilitation project in southeast Missouri; to the Committee on Appropriations.

610. Also, petition of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Lafayette, La., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to curtailment of the sugarcane crop in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 27, 1939

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 17, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, January 26, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calhoun, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2762) to consolidate and codify the internal-revenue laws of the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. I note the absence of a quorum and ask for a roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Downey	Lewis	Schwartz
Andrews	Ellender	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Ashurst	Frazier	Logan	Sheppard
Austin	George	Lucas	Shipstead
Bailey	Gerry	Lundeen	Smathers
Bankhead	Gibson	McCarran	Smith
Barbour	Gillette	McKellar	Stewart
Barkley	Glass	McNary	Taft
Bilbo	Green	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Gurney	Miller	Tobey
Brown	Hale	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Harrison	Murray	Truman
Burke	Hatch	Neely	Tydings
Byrd	Hayden	Norris	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Herring	Nye	Van Nuys
Capper	Hill	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Caraway	Holman	Overton	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Pittman	White
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wiley
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reed	
Davis	La Follette	Reynolds	
Donahey	Lee	Russell	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is detained on important public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE FOR LEGISLATIVE ESTABLISHMENT (S. DOC. NO. 26)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, Architect of the Capitol, for the fiscal year 1939, in the amount of \$1,200, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DECEMBER 1938 REPORT OF THE R. F. C.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities and expenditures of the Corporation for the month of December 1938, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

FINANCIAL REPORTS OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate letters from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a corrected statement of the receipts and expenditures of the company for the full year 1938, together with a comparative general balance sheet of the company for the same year, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Whereas it is to the best interests of the people of the State of Colorado and to the people of the United States that the Congress of the United States liberalize and enlarge the provisions of the Social Security Act to establish increased Federal grants for assistance to aged persons in need; and

Whereas said benefits can be accomplished by amendments to the Social Security Act increasing the allotment of matching funds to the States to be used for such purpose: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the thirty-second general assembly (the senate concurring herein), That this general assembly memorialize the Congress of the United States to take such action as will accomplish the purpose of this resolution; be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States be requested to give their support to any measure that will increase the grants-in-aid to the States for the purpose of assistance to aged persons in need, and that copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Colorado in the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate telegrams in the nature of petitions from William H. Shenners, Jr., executive secretary, Wisconsin Democratic State Central Committee, and Maurice Fitzsimons, Jr., chairman, Democratic legislative caucus, both of Madison, Wis., praying for a public hearing on the nomination of Thomas R. Amlie to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and also that they be advised thereof so that due opportunity may be had for the presentation of testimony, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a petition from F. D. Cowdery, of New York City, praying that the proposed reduction in the W. P. A. appropriation be sustained by the Senate, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate telegrams in the nature of petitions from several citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the appropriation of \$875,000,000 for the W. P. A., as